



3 1761 11652986 8

RB11223



Library  
of the  
University of Toronto

HANDBOUND  
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF  
TORONTO PRESS





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
University of Toronto





9042

# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No.:

1

DATE:

APRIL 21, 1964

OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865

364-7383





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1

2

3

4

ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

5

6

7

8

9

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Tuesday, April 21st,  
1964, commencing at 10:00 a.m.,  
et seq.

10

11

12

COMMISSION:

13

14

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C. Commissioner

15

F. H. Finnis Secretary

16

L. Feldman Research  
Officer

17

T. Plunkett Municipal  
Consultant

18

19

20

21

22

\* \* \* \* \*

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1

2

3

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

4

DESCRIPTION

PAGES

5

6

WILLIAM R. ALLEN, Q.C.

5-29

7

8

YORK TOWNSHIP

30-50

9

10

TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

51-86

11

THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN  
OF WESTON

87-94

12

13

14

15

16

\* \* \* \* \*

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1 THE CHAIRMAN: As this opens the hearings  
2 of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto, I am  
3 going to ask Mr. Finnis, the Secretary, to read the  
4 specific Terms of Reference for the record.

5 THE SECRETARY: These terms dated 20th  
6 day of June A.D. 1963 are as follows:

7 Upon the recommendations of the Honourable  
8 the Prime Minister, the Committee of Council  
9 advise that pursuant to the provisions of The  
10 Public Inquiries Act, R.S.O. 1960, Chapter  
11 323, and effective from June 18th, 1963, a  
12 Commission be issued appointing

13 Mr. H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.,  
14 of the City of Montreal, as Commissioner, desig-  
15 nating him as The Royal Commission on Metro-  
16 politan Toronto,

17 (1) to inquire into and report upon

18 (a) the structure and organization of  
19 the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto  
20 and, more particularly, of the Metro-  
21 politan Council and the Metropolitan  
22 School Board, their functions and  
23 responsibilities and their relations with  
24 the area municipalities and the local  
25 school boards respectively and with  
26 municipalities and planning boards with-  
27 in the Metropolitan Toronto planning area,

28 (b) the purposes and objectives of  
29 the establishment of the Metropolitan  
30 Corporation and the Metropolitan School





1 Board, the extent of the accomplishment  
2 of such objectives and whether such ob-  
3 jectives can be better achieved under a  
4 new or revised system of local govern-  
5 ment, having regard to the past and  
6 future development and needs,

7 (c) the boundaries of the metropolitan  
8 area and of the area municipalities and  
9 their suitability in the light of the  
10 experience gained through the opera-  
11 tions of the metropolitan government,  
12 with due regard to probable future  
13 urban growth within or beyond the  
14 present metropolitan limits and future  
15 service requirements,

16 (d) any related matters affecting the  
17 government of the Toronto metropolitan  
18 region.

19 (2) after due study and consideration to make  
20 such recommendations with respect to the matters  
21 inquired into under the terms set out herein  
22 as the Commissioner sees fit to the Prime  
23 Minister and the Executive Council of Ontario.

24 The Commission further advise that  
25 pursuant to the said Public Inquiries Act the  
26 said Commissioner shall have the power of  
27 summoning any person and requiring him to give  
28 evidence on oath to produce such documents and  
29 things as the Commissioner deems requisite for  
30 the full investigation of the matters into





1 which he is appointed to examine;

2 And the Committee further advise  
3 that all Government departments, boards, agencies  
4 and committees shall assist, to the fullest ex-  
5 tent, the said Commissioner who, in order to  
6 carry out his duties and functions, shall have  
7 the power and authority to engage such staff,  
8 secretarial and otherwise, and technical  
9 advisers as he deems proper.

10 Certified,

11 "J. J. Young"

12 Clerk, Executive Council.

13  
14 THE CHAIRMAN: I think it is quite clear  
15 when one reads the Terms of Reference that there was  
16 not much left out and I am hoping through these hearings  
17 to receive a great deal of assistance in my rather for-  
18 midable task of trying to find a solution to the pro-  
19 blems before the Toronto Metropolitan Area.

20 The briefs have been very helpful. I have  
21 read most of them and I am saying this for the benefit  
22 of the parties who are appearing. I do not expect  
23 anyone to read through their whole brief as I have  
24 already read them. I would prefer a summary and any  
25 addition that the party wants to make.

26 I am not going to impose any formal rules.  
27 I am going to try to conduct these hearings as infor-  
28 mally as possible, within limits, of course, and I hope  
29 that the questions I will be putting will not be inter-  
30 preted as conclusions which I have reached.





1                   When I ask questions, the sole purpose  
2 will be to clarify something in the brief that I want  
3 clarified.

4                   I am going to sit, as the schedule which  
5 most of you have seen, shows, about three days a week  
6 from ten to twelve-thirty and from two to four.

7                   If changes are necessary I shall make them  
8 in due course.

9                   The first witness is Mr. William R. Allen,  
10 Q.C., Chairman of the Metropolitan Council, who has  
11 submitted a brief on his own behalf.     Mr. Allen.

12                   You may stand or be seated as you prefer.

13                   MR. ALLEN:     Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

14  
15                                   SUBMISSION BY  
16                                   WILLIAM R. ALLEN, Q.C.

17                   Appearances:

18                   William R. Allen, Q.C., on his own behalf.

19  
20                   THE CHAIRMAN:     I did not mean to say, Mr.  
21 Allen, if there are parts of your brief you want to  
22 read, you are to read them.     I am not trying to dictate  
23 to you.     I do think it would take much longer than the  
24 time I have set aside for the hearings if everybody is  
25 going to read their brief in full.

26                   MR. ALLEN:     Well, sir, I would certainly  
27 prefer not to read it once more.     I have read it so  
28 often now I am a little tired of it.

29                   THE CHAIRMAN:     But you are still convinced.

30                   MR. ALLEN:     Yes, I become so.





1 Mr. Commissioner, in appreciating you have  
2 read the brief which I have submitted on my own behalf,  
3 I would like to perhaps fortify some of the conclusions  
4 reached by a very brief and summary review of the  
5 thoughts which are perhaps more in my mind than is  
6 possible to have put on paper. There are certain  
7 features that have occurred to me and impressed me over  
8 the years to which I should like to make reference and  
9 perhaps more forcibly than I was able to do on paper,  
10 but leading to the same conclusion.

11 During the almost interminable discussions  
12 on this subject particularly during the past few years,  
13 it has occurred to me quite regularly there is a mis-  
14 understanding on the precise meaning of certain terms  
15 which are used interchangeably by different people.  
16 I would like to clarify my particular interpretation  
17 of such as: "What is meant by 'amalgamation'?" "What  
18 is mean by the Metropolitan system or 'Borough System' -  
19 as the term is used quite regularly.

20 I believe that on the basis of the pro-  
21 blems with which we are faced and I say unhesitatingly  
22 we have problems and there are improvements that can  
23 be made -- we can hardly say we have come through  
24 ten years of pioneering experience without having  
25 learned something that will be an improvement for the  
26 future.

27 As I understand the term Amalgamation as  
28 it is proposed in its various alternatives, it means  
29 that there would be one municipal government for the  
30 entire area.





1 For the purposes of the discussion at this  
2 moment, I will take the Metropolitan Area as it is  
3 today. One still supposedly local municipal council,  
4 administering all municipal services and I emphasize  
5 the "oneness" and I emphasize "all municipal services"  
6 because as I analyse the term metropolitanization or  
7 metropolitan theory of government, it is something  
8 that is entirely different. In fact, it is so dif-  
9 ferent that it is actually opposed to amalgamation.

10 The theory of the Metropolitan government  
11 is a dual level not a oneness, as you have in amalga-  
12 mation, and a dual level serves a dual purpose, which  
13 is predicated on a delineration between area services  
14 that are both necessary and required by all of the  
15 people in the area, but quite separate, distinct and  
16 apart from local services; the degree or number of  
17 type of which is within the discretion of the people to  
18 be served.

19 So, while Amalgamation groups everything,  
20 I say, quite opposed to that is the Metropolitan theory  
21 which does in fact distinguish area, regional, basic  
22 and essential services for all the people within the  
23 Federation as distinct and separate from local services  
24 to which there should remain a degree of discretion and  
25 local choice.

26 One can talk at some length and I have  
27 found this a most interesting field of study. I be-  
28 lieve it has been said and written time and again that  
29 the nineteenth century was the era during which the  
30 place of municipal government in the three-tier system





1 which settled and resolved the type and role of  
2 municipal government.

3 Today, it seems to me we must take that  
4 nineteenth century solution, which was arrived at when  
5 communities, particularly urban communities, were  
6 isolated and accept the fact that there have been  
7 changes as a result of urbanization; nowhere to a  
8 greater degree than in Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto,  
9 which placed an impact on social welfare services at  
10 the municipal level. So, I think that we must treat  
11 and regard the theory of Metropolitan Government as our  
12 answer to the twentieth century problems which  
13 were only partially met by the nineteenth century answer  
14 in the establishment of cities, towns and villages and  
15 which did not at that time allow for relations between  
16 municipalities which find themselves suddenly one of  
17 a cluster of municipalities.

18 It is perhaps an unusual start for one who  
19 has been given the problems which are yours, sir, at  
20 least if unanimity is possible at one point. Among  
21 the briefs that have been submitted to you, none have  
22 recommended a return to the pre-1953 and so from my  
23 point of view, I would interpret that at least you  
24 are starting on a basis of some success to a greater  
25 or lesser degree, depending on what one is proposing  
26 here.

27 Seeing the distinction between complete  
28 amalgamation and the Metropolitan form of government  
29 is a federation of components, I would like to deal --  
30 and this leads me to my final conclusion, where I





1 believe that the federated system of component municipi-  
2 palities is preferable to the amalgamation system of  
3 one.

4 I am quite convinced that the amalgamation  
5 of the thirteen municipalities comprising this Metro-  
6 politan Area must inevitably lead to an overall area  
7 budget of many more dollars than is required today.  
8 The standardization and uniformity of services through-  
9 out the area will of necessity mean a greater area  
10 budget. First of all, wages for all of the amalgamated  
11 employees will have to rise to the level of the highest  
12 that is in existence today. Unification of the  
13 police department has borne that out.

14 The standards of services in which there  
15 is discretion today, particularly those which I refer  
16 to as local services, will tend towards the best  
17 services and so with that combination of an increase  
18 in the standard of services, an increase in the wages  
19 and costs of these services, there must be an overall  
20 increase in the area budget.

21 When one proposes amalgamation on the basis  
22 of equalization of tax rates I submit to you, sir, that  
23 it is basic logic that can only be justified if there  
24 is an accompanying equality of equity in the standard  
25 of services. Equalization of tax rates without  
26 equalization of the standard of services cannot be  
27 justified because then you would just have a different  
28 group of people paying for better services being  
29 enjoyed by others.

30 There is a theory advanced that amalgamation





1 will reduce overlapping and duplication. I refer to  
2 the experience which we have had with the Police  
3 Department and the Assessment Department. Both took  
4 over component units and unified into one. There  
5 was no dislocation of staff, in fact, if anything,  
6 there was required a new level of supervision to co-  
7 ordinate policies throughout the larger areas that  
8 were under one jurisdiction and in both cases I say  
9 that the additional costs that were involved have  
10 been well justified by the results. The increased  
11 efficiency of a unified Police Department has well  
12 warranted the additional costs that have been involved.  
13 Likewise, the Assessment Department's increased cost  
14 has been basic to the financial problems of this area  
15 and only in that way has it permitted the levying of  
16 the Metropolitan cost across the area on an equitable  
17 basis.

18 When one concludes that there will be a  
19 higher budget required for the entire area, I look  
20 at the City of Toronto. In my opinion, again I  
21 tried to bring this down to a simple fact, the City  
22 of Toronto taxpayer will suffer more dollarwise by  
23 amalgamation than any other taxpayer. That may sound  
24 as a sweeping statement. First of all the increased  
25 budgets throughout the area will reflect in the City  
26 of Toronto as elsewhere.

27 The City of Toronto happens to have a graded  
28 tax exemption policy which is also applicable in Toronto  
29 but because of the numbers, let me just deal with the  
30 City of Toronto.





1                   Ninety thousand taxpayers in the City of  
2 Toronto enjoy the benefit of a subsidy on their taxes  
3 under that policy. This is internal, within the City  
4 of Toronto. It is as a result of a plebiscite back  
5 in the 1920's and whether one agrees or disagrees with  
6 the system, the fact is that it is there and it has  
7 benefited those who are living in homes assessed under  
8 \$4,000.

9                   Ninety thousand people will lose that  
10 exemption. I submit that they are the last who can  
11 afford to lose that benefit, where we have such spiral-  
12 ling municipal tax rates, but perhaps the position  
13 of the city may better be understood -- and one has  
14 to detach themselves from emotion and local precon-  
15 ceived opinions to appreciate this -- on an assessment  
16 basis the City of Toronto this year will be footing  
17 about 45-2/3 per cent of the Metropolitan bill and  
18 presumably so under amalgamation. They would pay  
19 45-2/3 per cent of the total cost of municipal govern-  
20 ment yet its population is only roughly 38 per cent  
21 of the total but perhaps more significant, when it  
22 comes to the cost of municipal services, is the fact  
23 it occupies only 14 per cent of the space in this area  
24 and so when it takes 14 per cent of the space and  
25 relates that to the mileage of roadways, the mileage  
26 of sidewalks and the acreage of public parks, you are  
27 paying 45 per cent of the total cost of roadways when  
28 you only have 14 per cent of the mileage within your  
29 boundaries.

30                   As you are presently constituted the cost is  
bound to be more if you have equality of services.





1 In support of this -- and if it is not a  
2 correct news quote it is a very recent one from the  
3 Globe and Mail of Tuesday, April 14th; last Tuesday  
4 morning -- and because I agree completely with the  
5 spokesman I am referring to it. The spokesman is the  
6 City Treasurer for the City of Toronto. Mr. Campbell,  
7 the City Treasurer, said the single difference of opinion  
8 between himself and Mr. Hardy is that the consultant  
9 suggests amalgamation would bring about financial savings  
10 and reduce the tax rate.

11 Mr. Campbell if we extend existing  
12 city services to the suburbs from amalgamation there is  
13 no doubt that costs will go up', said the City Treasurer."

14 I agree completely with that statement and  
15 that is why I say that amalgamation will be more costly  
16 to the City of Toronto than it will be to any other  
17 municipality.

18 So on the basis of cost I suggest that the  
19 ability of a metropolitan form of government to deal with  
20 those area services on an area-wide basis and a fair share  
21 levy on the basis of assessment wealth throughout the  
22 area is acceptable to all and fair to all. But it is  
23 eminently more fair that each of the component municipi-  
24 palities and their taxpayers shall have the choice to  
25 say the degree, the type and to what extent those optional  
26 or discretionary local services shall be enjoyed.

27 Another aspect of amalgamation; in 1964 there  
28 were thirteen Municipalities pretty well urbanized today  
29 amalgamated into one, presumably on the one plea ---  
30 equality of tax rate, sharing of costs. Ten years





1 from now I do not think it takes very much imagination  
2 to picture the degree of urbanization which will have  
3 taken place along what we will call the boundaries of  
4 the present metropolitan political unit. The cry the,  
5 equalization of tax rate to be extended out and beyond  
6 the present perimeters, will be just as justifiable as  
7 to-day.

8           So it seems to me that amalgamation with  
9 each step casts the die for the next step to the point  
10 that it becomes actually uncontrollable. On the other  
11 hand a federation which is charged with the responsibility  
12 of those area services is a much more flexible, a viable  
13 unit. It can be increased by adding a component as and  
14 when considered desirable. It can be interchanged, or  
15 the boundaries of the components can be interchanged. And  
16 there is that degree of flexibility which is totally  
17 lacking in a policy of amalgamation which can only extend  
18 itself beyond and beyond.

19           It may be of some significance to you that  
20 in December of 1961 the Metropolitan Council by a vote  
21 of fifteen to nine endorsed continuation of a metropolitan  
22 system of government. Last month, March 11th, by an  
23 almost identical vote -- this time fourteen to nine; one  
24 member absent -- Council endorsed the very same resolution  
25 -- continuation of a metropolitan system of government.

26           Having attempted to distinguish between the  
27 two systems and indicate my reasons for preferring a  
28 continuation of a metropolitan or federated system  
29 involving component municipalities, I should like to  
30





1 proceed to the proposal which I have submitted to you,  
2 sir.

3           There has been intermittent criticism of the  
4 present metropolitan system to the effect that it has  
5 been unable or has been lacking in ability to make  
6 decisions. I find it almost difficult to answer that  
7 question by other than confronting those who would say  
8 that with the capital budget for 1964 for the metropolitan  
9 corporation -- \$210,000,000.00. The expenditure of that  
10 money represents so many decisions of that council.  
11 Every dollar represents a decision to do something.

12           In fact today we are just wondering where  
13 does our spiral stop? I look at the current budget at  
14 an all time high of \$115,000,000.00. Every dollar  
15 represents a decision to provide some type or another  
16 of service to the people of Metropolitan Toronto. So  
17 personally I dismiss that criticism. I think Metropolitan  
18 Toronto Council in a ten-year period has shown a  
19 remarkable ability to make decisions and to execute them  
20 with a minimum of delay, with dispatch, with speed and  
21 with a minimum of inconvenience to the public.

22           There has been criticism of our system of  
23 government, of the structure of the council, its  
24 composition, the distribution of voting strength. With  
25 that criticism I find myself in complete agreement.

26           I think the original structure was quite  
27 the thing to do at the beginning. As I have said earlier,  
28 we are pioneers and I think we can all stand up quite  
29 proudly and look at our accomplishments. When I see those  
30 who come here from the four corners of the earth to see





1 what makes Metro tick, why is this thing working so well  
2 here when so many other places cannot get it off the  
3 ground? Oh, I think we have come a long way. As I said  
4 earlier also, I believe we have learned a lot as we have  
5 come along.

6 In the beginning the theory was fifty-fifty  
7 representation divided as between the city and the  
8 suburbs. At that time the City of Toronto had roughly  
9 56 percent of the population as compared with today's  
10 38 percent. It had 62 percent of the total assessment  
11 as compared with today's 45 percent.

12 There have been two movements which I believe  
13 are worthy of note and of much significance as we review  
14 the first decade. The first has been the declining  
15 population and assessment percentage of the City of  
16 Toronto -- and I do not minimise its importance as the  
17 hub and core. But secondly, as within the suburbs or  
18 the twelve other municipalities, I think there has been  
19 a movement which is of equal significance. That has been  
20 the disproportionate rate of growth as between different  
21 of the twelve municipalities. Some have remained almost  
22 status quo. Others are continuing to advance both in  
23 population and new assessment or additional assessment  
24 by leaps and bounds. I believe it is in this disparity  
25 that we should view what is a factual, a visible and  
26 a real weakness of the present system, -- a situation  
27 which can be improved upon. Change always brings its  
28 bitterness to some. No matter what is the proposed  
29 change it invites disappointment.

30 But I have looked at our situation in





1 Metropolitan Toronto as presently constituted and I  
2 believe that for the long term advantage of the area and  
3 all its components vast improvement would re-accrue  
4 from the re-vamping or re-organization of the thirteen  
5 component municipalities on a basis of six municipalities.  
6 They may be designated as cities or boroughs responsible  
7 for local services as the thirteen are today with a  
8 metropolitan council which would continue to be  
9 responsible as it is today for those area-wide or  
10 regional services which are basic to all. I believe there  
11 should be similarity in form of structure between the  
12 local councils regardless of their designation, each  
13 operating on a ward system under a board of control.  
14 There will be substituted for thirteen municipalities,  
15 which today represent extremes of population, extremes  
16 in degrees and types of municipal problems, there would  
17 be substituted six much more compatible municipalities  
18 -- compatible in the sense that they would be facing  
19 problems on a much more balanced scale and on a much  
20 more comprehensible basis to each other.

21 I believe that that type of re-organization  
22 would recognize this disparity in growth as between the  
23 twelve municipalities other than the City of Toronto.  
24 I believe that recognition of the position of the City  
25 of Toronto in relation to the faster growing municipalities  
26 can be adequately taken care of by a system of representa-  
27 tion on a metropolitan council which would apply the  
28 age-old principle of representation by population on an  
29 indicated basis of roughly one representative per  
30





1 one hundred thousand of population.

2 Having an estimated population of two  
3 million people by 1970 one could envisage a council  
4 of somewhat similar numbers to that which we have today.  
5 Again it provides for that flexibility because I do  
6 anticipate and would hope that we could look forward to  
7 almost a similar review to this to what will still be a  
8 pioneer even ten years from today as to what progress  
9 it has made as to what steps have been taken in the  
10 past ten years to improve upon what existed previously.

11 The composition of the six municipalities  
12 which I will propose is not a very difficult one but  
13 I will concede at the outset that this becomes a matter  
14 of almost a personal opinion as to where the lines are  
15 drawn. A block one way or the other I do not regard  
16 personally as material to what I am proposing, but as  
17 an outline and as a guide it seems to me that the  
18 Village of Swansea with a population of 9,300 people is  
19 geographically a part of Ward 7 of the City of Toronto.  
20 Even with the addition of this number of people Ward 7  
21 would continue to be the second smallest ward in the  
22 City of Toronto.

23 The Lakeshore communities, I propose to you  
24 sir, to be incorporated into the Township of Etobicoke.

25 I recognize how over the years local pride  
26 and community interest has been generated in a number  
27 of our municipalities. I would be most reluctant to  
28 do anything that would ever stifle or thwart continuation  
29 of that interest on the part of citizens. I have every  
30 faith and belief that the ward system will go a long





1 way in perpetuating that type of citizen participation.

2 The City of Toronto is still comprised of  
3 sections which are known today by their pre-annexation  
4 names and it is the finest thing that ever happened that  
5 they have that local pride, whether it be in the Beach in  
6 the east end or in North Toronto or in West Toronto.

7 Scarborough, it seems to me, is geographically  
8 well laid out with a projected population of 350,000 by  
9 1970 and occupying all of the lands within the Metropolitan  
10 Toronto area east of Victoria Park.

11 The Town of Weston; one might consider it  
12 for incorporation with North York or with York. I believe  
13 that there may be a balance to be indicated by the people  
14 of Weston as to their choice there. Looking at a map may  
15 or may not disclose which way that should be. But I  
16 do propose to you that in either case the area-wide  
17 purpose would be served.

18 The Village of Forest Hill, I believe should  
19 be united with the present Township of York located  
20 geographically as they are side by side and, as I have  
21 proposed to you in my submission, with a slight revision  
22 of boundary lines, which would be based more upon  
23 practical grounds using St. Clair and Avenue Road rather  
24 than the present jagged line that we have now.

25 Leaside and East York are two communities  
26 which I believe with their projected population of  
27 100,000 within the next two or three years could well  
28 be joined together and form a unit.

29 That would comprise the six municipalities  
30





1 designated as either cities or boroughs of Toronto -  
2 Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, York and East York.

3 As I have stated here, I do not regard that  
4 number of six as containing magic or going to perform  
5 the impossible, but with one thought which I think must  
6 permeate the entire consideration of your Commission, sir,  
7 and that is that we are moving upon success and it would  
8 be a terrible result were we to divert too far from what  
9 has proven successful in one single step whereby the  
10 benefits of the past ten years could be placed in  
11 jeopardy.

12 So while I propose six at this time I realize  
13 that this is the mid 1960's and I believe that the  
14 diseminal review of the organization of this area may  
15 dictate something else in the future.

16 Again that points out the value and the  
17 preference for the metropolitan theory of local government  
18 as against an amalgamated single unit which would not  
19 permit of the unscrambling of the egg at a later date  
20 should it fail to produce the results which are  
21 predicted of it.

22 I believe, sir, that that brings me to the  
23 conclusion of the proposal for the reorganization of the  
24 municipal structure of this area which I have submitted  
25 to you. I have dealt in my submission in certain other  
26 matters of education planning and public housing. Frankly  
27 I have nothing to add to those at this time and I am  
28 prepared to leave the written word stand as is on those  
29 individual or detailed items.

30 I should be pleased to answer an observations





1 or enquiries which you may have.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Allan.  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 THE COMMISSIONER: In passing, I notice  
2 that on page 8 of your brief you say "Metropolitan Toronto  
3 counts a population approximating 1,700,000. Present  
4 population exceeds eight of ten provinces." Then you  
5 ask "Could a single council for that number be local  
6 government in fact?" You know, of course, I am from  
7 the City of Montreal where we do have local government  
8 for about 1,200,000.

9 MR. ALLEN: I hesitate to get into com-  
10 parisons with Montreal.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Probably unfair. I just  
12 did not want the inference that we have not got local  
13 government in Montreal. Now, in your suggested re-  
14 vision of boundaries, consolidation into six munici-  
15 palities, you would leave Scarborough as it is as  
16 one of the boroughs or cities.

17 Now, there is a great deal of argument about  
18 imbalance, economic imbalance in the area, related to  
19 lower assessments per capita in certain municipalities.  
20 Scarborough is the one on the basis of the figures  
21 which I have that has the lowest assessment per  
22 capita. Would the consolidation that you suggest  
23 in any way help relieve the problem of Scarborough,  
24 assuming there is a problem? Do I make myself clear,  
25 Mr. Allen?

26 MR. ALLEN: Yes, you do, sir. In my view  
27 perhaps the most serious problem in Scarborough has  
28 been educational costs where their school population  
29 has far outstripped a desirable assessment per capita.

30 Earlier this year, in fact I believe after the





1 submission was written, although it may be noted here,  
2 Metropolitan Council entered into agreement with the  
3 Metropolitan School Board by which the Metropolitan  
4 School Board has assumed all capital cost of school  
5 construction and renovation up to what we regard as  
6 ceiling formula so that since January 1st of this  
7 year school construction in Scarborough will cost the  
8 taxpayer in Scarborough considerably less than it cost  
9 him previously in that the local share in a good many  
10 cases will be removed completely so that the assessment  
11 throughout the Metropolitan area will be paying for  
12 the schools in Scarborough. That has been one of  
13 the balancing factors.

14 Secondly, again at Metropolitan School  
15 Board level they have increased the payments of main-  
16 tenance assistance, which, if I may just develop that  
17 for a moment, maintenance assistance payments per  
18 pupil is really a redistribution of wealth through  
19 the area. To me it is a partial result that would  
20 accrue to 100 per cent under amalgamation.

21 The City of Toronto has opposed this in-  
22 crease in maintenance assistance grants because the  
23 assessment in Toronto results in more being paid out for  
24 school boards than such schools receive, but under  
25 amalgamation the result would be exaggerated with just  
26 that much more if there were complete equalization.  
27 However, coming back to Scarborough in particular, I  
28 believe that assistance in both these fields in respect  
29 of their school costs is going to remove the clamp  
30 which they have had around them for the last few years





1 and of which we are quite aware.

2 As to how you can get more industrial  
3 assessment in Scarborough, I think one has to look at  
4 official plans. Now, it is a well known fact, and it  
5 is an accepted one, industrial growth has sort of been  
6 in a westerly and northwesterly direction. There are  
7 any number of economic reasons for it, not the least of  
8 which is an international airport right now out in the  
9 west end. There are attractions for industry in the  
10 west and northwest that are not existent in the east  
11 as yet. I think that is something which can only be  
12 dealt with to a limited degree by Planning Board and  
13 by a drive for industrial assessment on the part of  
14 Scarborough. My proposal does not assist them to  
15 obtain any industrial assessment that they would not  
16 be obtaining under the present organization.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: But you look for great  
18 assistance or considerable assistance from the recent  
19 assumption of debt up to ceiling cost formula, and the  
20 increase in maintenance assistance?

21 MR. ALLEN: Yes. Those two decisions will  
22 bring immediate and material relief to Scarborough,  
23 particularly the latter.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Another question on  
25 the proposed consolidation which you recommend, as I  
26 look at the figures the population of each of these  
27 six cities would vary quite widely. You look to 1970.  
28 Does that give you any concern?

29 MR. ALLEN: Some concern, yes, but  
30 appreciably less than we have under the present





1 organization. Take Forest Hill -- this is not said  
2 critically of them at all; in fact they are to be ad-  
3 mired for their accomplishments -- I believe that they  
4 are 1/35th in population the size of the City of  
5 Toronto. Just here you would from the 35 to 1 ratio,  
6 if I take the most glaring one today, you would reduce  
7 that to one of 6-1/2 to 1 between the City of Toronto  
8 and I would take the East York structure of 100,000.....

9 THE COMMISSIONER: East York would be  
10 your smallest?

11 MR. ALLEN: That would be the smallest.  
12 Again, as I say, that figure of 6 does not contain  
13 magic. I am just trying to come to a conclusion which  
14 I would regard as a digestible reorganization at this  
15 time.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, coming to your  
17 proposal for representation on the Metropolitan Council,  
18 today the method of representation is quite clear and  
19 simple. There is the reeve or the mayor of each  
20 municipality and then the Toronto set-up. Under your  
21 proposal there would be, for example, 4 from North  
22 York, 3 from Etobicoke, 3 from Scarborough. How  
23 would you have these representatives elected or  
24 selected?

25 MR. ALLEN: I would certainly include the  
26 head of each municipality to commence with. As I have  
27 said, I believe it would be highly preferable and  
28 desirable that each of the six were organized on the  
29 same local basis, so each would have its own board  
30 of control. As in the case of the City of Toronto





1 today, half of the Board of Control are automatically  
2 members of Metro. Two senior members. I believe  
3 that would take care of possibly all -- it might even  
4 take care of the 4 from North York. Seven from  
5 Toronto would pose, I believe, a problem, and my only  
6 answer to it now is that other than the head of the  
7 municipalities, 2 from the Board of Control, the  
8 remainder would be by choice of Council.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Now, coming to your  
10 recommendations on education, which you have not dealt  
11 with because I have read them and they are all in your  
12 brief, you suggest that the Metropolitan School Board  
13 should be constituted as the bargaining agency for  
14 terms and conditions of employment within the Metro-  
15 politan School System. You say if this is done it  
16 will remove the competition which presently prevails  
17 between Boards in their efforts to obtain sufficient  
18 number of teaching personnel with the highest qualifi-  
19 cations.

20 I have to tell you that I have this sub-  
21 mission in quite a number of the briefs. Do you  
22 really think that uniform teacher salaries would solve  
23 the problem of providing the right number of teachers?

24 MR. ALLEN: It has come to us at Metro-  
25 politan Council in the same way you have read it in  
26 these briefs to which you referred. This is the  
27 situation as it was presented to us. We are trying  
28 to meet -- the Metropolitan School Board -- we are  
29 trying to equalize costs of education or make them more  
30 equal than they would be otherwise by a system of





1 assistance grants, and so the haves with the assessment  
2 are contributing to the have nots who have the children  
3 but not the assessment. Then one or another of these  
4 municipalities who actually are a have not, turn around  
5 and use their grants from the haves to offer higher  
6 salaries than are being offered elsewhere. So, I say,  
7 it is tied in directly, very closely, with the system  
8 of maintenance grants as between the different  
9 municipalities.

10 I believe that if there were only 6 municipi-  
11 palities to be dealt with, they could reach common  
12 agreement, but I gather from the results to date it  
13 has not been possible with the present 11 Boards that  
14 are represented on the Metropolitan School Board.  
15 There has been the opposition to increasing these  
16 maintenance grants if they are going to be used for  
17 the purpose of using our money to take teachers away  
18 from us. In other words, we are paying into the pot  
19 and you are using our money to offer more money to  
20 teachers so they leave us to go to you.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: You deal also with  
22 planning in your brief, and you refer to the official  
23 plan. My understanding is that the official metro-  
24 politan plan has not yet been adopted. Would you  
25 give me reasons for that, for the long delay in the  
26 adoption of the plan? Do you think it advisable that  
27 there be such delay?

28 MR. ALLEN: There was published a few  
29 years ago what we have come to call the draft official  
30 plan, circulated through all municipalities, and I think





1 it has served as an excellent guide, but in the form  
2 in which it was presented, could hardly be enacted as  
3 a legal document of official planning.

4 Planning staff has worked on what we will  
5 now term a proposed official plan. I believe all  
6 chapters, or all parts of it, have been completed  
7 and circularized through the municipalities except  
8 that of transportation. The problem with the trans-  
9 portation chapter is that a little over a year ago  
10 there was instituted by the government of this province  
11 a Metropolitan Toronto and Region Transportation Study,  
12 headed by the Ministers of Highway, Transport, Muni-  
13 cipal Affairs, and I am a member of it also.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: I have a copy of that.

15 MR. ALLEN: You have. Now I will say that  
16 to a degree the recommendations on transportation  
17 within the Metropolitan Toronto area are going to have  
18 to be related or synchronized to those which will come  
19 from the wider study, from Hamilton, Oshawa and Barrie.  
20 However, that does not account for the extreme delay.  
21 I do not believe, and I think I can say it in all  
22 fairness, it is not the fault of the staff. There  
23 has really been no concerted drive by any municipality  
24 for it.

25 The draft official plan has been used as  
26 a guide line in the processing of subdivision plans,  
27 local zoning bylaws, and I can just say that by con-  
28 vention we have a form of official planning not docu-  
29 mented.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: That is exactly what I





1 was going to suggest because that has happened else-  
2 where too where an official plan serves as a guide  
3 line although it is still unofficial. That is what  
4 you are saying?

5 MR.ALLEN: Yes. I think perhaps the  
6 Metropolitan Toronto or the composition, the respon-  
7 sibility could be more directly defined.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: You make that sugges-  
9 tion.

10 MR. ALLEN: There is a gray area here as  
11 to how far the Metropolitan planner should go into the  
12 local plan, and I think this may underscore the lack  
13 of drive on the part of anyone to produce or bring  
14 forward an official plan.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: With respect to housing,  
16 do I correctly understand your submission when I say  
17 it means the constitution of a Metropolitan Toronto  
18 housing agency responsible for all public housing  
19 activity within the area?

20 MR.ALLEN: That is correct, sir.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: And replacing all the  
22 existing agencies?

23 MR. ALLEN: In the form of which this  
24 was approved by the Metropolitan Council some two years  
25 ago, it provided for the power of the new housing  
26 agency to manage existing objects for a local munici-  
27 pality or local agency; not necessarily purchase  
28 equity and take over, but they could operate as a  
29 manager of it. I may say the difficulties in this  
30 field I believe will go far beyond what the Commission





1 can do here.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes?

3 MR.ALLEN: It just seems that we have  
4 been dogged by ill luck, the last of which was the  
5 death of Mr. Garland. We had a number of discussions  
6 on this subject and he obtained a real grasp of our  
7 problem here which just does not exist elsewhere at the  
8 hands of the two municipal levels, and it requires  
9 such a change in procedure for Central Housing and  
10 Mortgage Corporation, but they have to deal with us  
11 differently here.

12 Mr. Macaulay at the provincial level had  
13 become an ardent advocate of what is here, and he  
14 relinquished his post, and so it seems that we just  
15 get spokesmen at the proper level in this field and  
16 have to start all over again.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1 I am satisfied that there has been some improvement since  
2 this was written due to the, almost say, excellent co-  
3 operation of Mr. Garland. A committee was set up for  
4 our problem specifically comprised of a top official of  
5 Central Mortgage, a senior official at the Provincial  
6 level and our senior housing official and Commissioner  
7 and the three of them are meeting at least every second  
8 week and they are right into the minute details of every  
9 public housing project that is on the boards here, and  
10 bit by bit they are making some progress, not the least  
11 of which has been the resolution of the problem over  
12 Thistletown.

13 To that Committee goes the credit for un-  
14 tangling that ball of wax; so while I think this is ideal,  
15 I am not that optimistic that it can be accomplished over-  
16 night.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Well, those are all the  
18 questions I have, Mr. Allen. I want to thank you very  
19 much for your presentation.

20 MR. ALLEN: Thank you, sir.

21 The Commission will adjourn for five minutes  
22 and then York Township will be called.

23 ---ADJOURNED AT 11:09 A.M.

24 ---RESUMED AT 11:19 A.M.

25 SUBMISSION OF YORK TOWNSHIP

26 Appearances:

27 Reeve Mould, Reeve of York Township.  
28 J. B. Conlin, Q.C., Counsel  
29 Mr. Boland, Solicitor of York Township.  
30 Mr. Courtman, Clerk of York Township.





1 Mr. Bertram

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, Reeve Mould.

3 REEVE MOULD: I present this brief on  
4 behalf of the Council of the Township of York which was  
5 unanimously approved by our Council without reservation  
6 and Council wishes that Mr. John Conlin act as our  
7 counsel and he will present the brief and make any  
8 comments that are necessary.

9 MR. CONLIN: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.  
10 Unlike the previous witness I am not a member of any of  
11 the component councils. I have known Mr. Allen many  
12 years and I might say know that he has grown up in  
13 municipal affairs over a long period of time so that it  
14 is conceivable that there may be some questions which  
15 can be directed to me by yourself at the conclusion of  
16 my presentation upon which I may have to request an op-  
17 portunity for consultation.

18 I have brought with me Reeve Mould. I have  
19 Mr. Courtman, the Clerk of the Municipality. I have as  
20 well Mr. Boland, the Solicitor for the Municipality and  
21 Mr. Bertram, the Auditor. Among them, I would antici-  
22 pate obtaining such answers as may be required to any  
23 questions you direct my way.

24 I think my chore for the Municipality is  
25 somewhat shortened before you here by reason of my  
26 hearing of what Mr. Allen had to say for the first time  
27 for I adopt and the Municipality adopt a very substantial  
28 amount of the context of his submission to you.

29 In fact, our submission, which has been put  
30 before you some while back and which has not been published,





1 is in substantial conformity with what Mr. Allen had to  
2 say to you and modifies it in modest respect.

3 I adopt on behalf of my client entirely his  
4 terminology with regard to the two goals of amalgamation  
5 as such as opposed to the federated or metropolitan form  
6 of government and we concur in his submission to you of  
7 the impact of what would occur were complete and total  
8 amalgamation to be adopted within the confines of the  
9 geography of Metropolitan Toronto, as it exists today.

10 I would add one further submission to you,  
11 sir, beyond what Mr. Allen said in respect of the  
12 result if it were to be adopted. He has dealt most  
13 ably and certainly more ably than I personally could with  
14 the financial impact which would result from amalgamation  
15 but again having to divorce oneself from any of the  
16 municipalities in order to take an objective look at it,  
17 it is our considered view and it is my considered  
18 opinion from innumerable appearances before the  
19 component parts of the Municipality of Metropolitan  
20 Toronto over a series of years, that the result of  
21 amalgamation as a whole would in fact create what might  
22 be other problems.

23 I would draw to your attention, Mr.  
24 Commissioner, the fact that in the City of Toronto, and  
25 taking it as it exists today, with a population in the  
26 order of 645,000 people and a modest increase suggested  
27 to about 650,000 by the projections available for the  
28 draft plan of Metro, that when you have a Council com-  
29 prising a Mayor, four members of the Board of Control  
30 and some eighteen Aldermen, you have therefore some





1 twenty-three Municipal representatives for about  
2 645,000 people.

3 If there were complete amalgamation,  
4 immediately the population of that unified unit would  
5 be galvanized to 1,625,000 or 1,630,000 approximately;  
6 and in order to continue representations at the  
7 municipal level at approximately the same proportionate  
8 rate as the City is now afforded, that Council would,  
9 in my submission, have to immediately increase from  
10 twenty-three to probably fifty-three.

11 I suggest that in that increase the Board of  
12 Control might well increase to six rather than four and  
13 there would be a total of some forty-six Aldermen, that  
14 is as it exists today, assuming that the representation  
15 should be roughly proportionate to what it is at the  
16 moment, which I think, is a desirable result and one  
17 which all levels of government seek to achieve; even  
18 when you consider the Senior Government having before it  
19 a redistribution of seats required in order to give  
20 reasonable representation at that level and adopting  
21 ridings with fluctuating populations of roughly 50,000  
22 to 75,000 people.

23 If we adopt, and I point out to you, sir,  
24 that we have relied to a large extent on statistical  
25 data with regard to projecting from our own knowledges  
26 and from data available out of the Metropolitan Employment  
27 Authority - do project that population with the  
28 geography of Metropolitan Toronto, as it exists today,  
29 confining oneself entirely to the three councils, there  
30 would be a population by 1980, estimated at 2,300,000.





1 The same source of material indicates that the total  
2 capacity is in the order of 2,500,000.

3 Now, again on the extrapolation of these  
4 proportions, as they exist in the City as we apprehend  
5 them, there would be every 300 prospect to achieve  
6 the same proportionate representation on a single  
7 municipal council, by having to establish a Council  
8 comprising a Mayor, probably six members of the Board of  
9 Control and Aldermen to bring it up to a total of about  
10 seventy-eight persons.

11 As municipal government is operated in the  
12 Province of Ontario - and I like my predecessor in this  
13 chair, shy away from any observation as to what may  
14 have occurred, but as we apprehend the operation of a  
15 municipal government under the Municipal Act, where each  
16 person is a party unto himself and party politics does  
17 not apply, it is our submission to you that a Council of  
18 such magnitude called upon to deal - not only with area  
19 problems - but with the minution of local problems, which  
20 we believe should remain local; - would flounder in its  
21 own administrative weight.

22 Now, that is the only other observation  
23 beyond the adoption of Mr. Allen's submissions to you  
24 on the financial impact that would follow, in our sub-  
25 mission, to you if there were total amalgamation. We  
26 are whole-heartedly in support of the continued form of  
27 metropolitan government. It is our considered opinion  
28 that it should continue but it obviously requires  
29 modification.

30 The matters which were raised by Mr. Allen





1 about the disparity of representation on the Council of  
2 Metropolitan Toronto by the municipalities as they now  
3 exist, adopting what he had to observe to you about the  
4 small municipalities as opposed to the large, and in  
5 passing I might take as an example Swansea and  
6 Scarborough where at the moment Scarborough with a  
7 population of something in the order 230,000 and a  
8 total assessment of something like \$455,500,000 has  
9 the same representation as Swansea with about  
10 9,300 (sic) and an assessment of twenty-three and a  
11 third million dollars.

12 These disparities, in our submission, are  
13 ones that require resolution. We feel this is the flaw  
14 of Metro as it exists and that the inequality of  
15 representation unless it in some way resolves will  
16 continue the discord not only between the City of  
17 Toronto and the surrounding municipalities but among  
18 the surrounding municipalities themselves.

19 We attacked this problem and we have sub-  
20 mitted to you, as you are well aware from the brief, a  
21 proposal under which there should be six component  
22 municipalities, the terminology for which we have  
23 adopted as "boroughs".

24 Our proposal to you differs from that  
25 which Mr. Allen has put before you and I will explain  
26 the reason. Our proposal differs in geography. We  
27 propose that the Borough of Toronto would comprise the  
28 present City of Toronto and Swansea.

29 The Borough of Etobicoke would comprise  
30 the present Municipality of Etobicoke plus the three





1 Lake Shore Municipalities.

2 We propose a variation of the geographic  
3 limits of North York, York and East York. We propose  
4 and for these reasons, that the Borough of York should  
5 comprise the Township of York, the Village of Forest Hill,  
6 the Town of Weston and that part of the Township of North  
7 York which runs to the south of Highway 401, west of  
8 Yonge Street.

9 We propose that the Borough of East York  
10 should consist of the Township of East York, the Town of  
11 Leaside and that part of the Township of North York lying  
12 south of Highway 401 and east of Yonge Street.

13 We propose that the Borough of Scarborough  
14 comprise what is the Township of Scarborough now with  
15 observations to you concerning its subsequent revision  
16 as circumstances warrant them.

17 We propose that the Borough of North York  
18 should consist of all of that portion of the Township of  
19 North York presently existing and lying north of Highway  
20 401. We would propose that the Borough of North York  
21 should extend northerly from its present limit at  
22 Steele's to Highway 407. Reference to the map which is  
23 at your right, Mr. Commissioner, will indicate Highway  
24 407 as it proceeds from west to east across the  
25 Townships of Vaughan and Markham and it crosses Yonge  
26 Street at what is presently known as Langstaff Road.  
27 An examination of that now advanced document to what  
28 is called the proposed draft plan of Metropolitan  
29 Toronto reveals that the urban development within the  
30 area and encompassed by the Planning Authority  
of Metropolitan Toronto in a northerly direction is sub-





1   stantially encompassed within that northerly boundary  
2   being proposed.

3               Legislative action at the local level has  
4   already been taken by Vaughan Township and Markham  
5   Township in the form of restricted area by-laws which in  
6   fact propound a restriction in development beyond the  
7   two concessions, east and west - that is Concession 1  
8   east and Concession 1 west of Yonge Street.

9               We believe there is justification for  
10   bringing within the actual governmental authority of  
11   Metropolitan Toronto, as we suggest it should be amended,  
12   of all of this area which we would contemplate will be  
13   developed in an urban fashion.

14              It is for this reason that we feel there is  
15   justification for thrusting the boundary of the Township  
16   of North York northerly to that highway limit.

17              Now, in the context that brings me then  
18   again to Scarborough, you will have before you, in my  
19   brief, the population of the proposed boroughs as they  
20   exist today on page 12 and you will see that the  
21   Borough of North York as enlarged would in our estimate  
22   of thinking ultimately end up with a population of about  
23   364,000.

24              The Borough of Scarborough, on the other  
25   hand, as it is at the moment has a population of about  
26   230,000 and in the projected increase of the population  
27   between now and 1980 we would anticipate it would grow  
28   to about 490,000.

29              In the selection of the six boroughs we  
30   have propounded, we were inspired in some respect by the





1 geography of the existing boundary limits but in addition  
2 we were propounding that within the ability to do so,  
3 the boroughs should achieve a population somewhere in  
4 the order of 250,000 or some modest increase beyond that.

5           Scarborough, in the easterly limits, as you  
6 will note by the map on the wall, encompasses a very  
7 large undeveloped segment of Scarborough which at the  
8 moment lies to the north of Highway 401.

9           In our submission to you, where we contemplate  
10 that as Scarborough completes its development, sub-  
11 stantially all of which will be to the north of Highway  
12 401 and south of Highway 407 through Markham, that could  
13 and probably should be called one of the component  
14 municipalities, whether it be Scarborough North,  
15 Scarborough South, or by some other designation.

16           Having adopted and submitted to you that  
17 these adoptions are appropriate for your consideration,  
18 we then examine into the complex problem of representation  
19 upon the Metropolitan Council.     As Mr. Allen adequately  
20 pointed out to you, when the Federated form of government  
21 commenced in 1953 the City of Toronto was given represent-  
22 ation to the extent of one half of Council and the  
23 suburban municipalities surrounding it the other half.  
24 There was certainly justification for it.

25  
26 -

27  
28 -  
29  
30





1 We concur that the City of Toronto with  
2 its substantial assessment was the whiphand on which  
3 the federated form of government commenced. But, as has  
4 been pointed out, the population in disparity in favour  
5 of the suburban municipalities as against the City proper  
6 has been growing and similarly in respect to assessment.

7 At the moment the City of Toronto population  
8 comprises about 40 per cent. The City's total assess-  
9 ment comprises about 45 per cent. On neither of these  
10 bases therefore is there justification for continuing  
11 representation in council strictly one half in favour  
12 of the City and one half in favour of the suburban  
13 municipalities.

14 Similarly the per capita assessment as a  
15 whole of the City does not warrant this continued one  
16 half of council representation in Metropolitan Toronto,  
17 but there is justification for this continued one half  
18 as at the moment in our opinion when you analyze the per  
19 capita assessment as to residential and as to non-  
20 residential.

21 On the present assessment within the borough  
22 of Toronto, and adopting Swansea into it, the residential  
23 assessment per capita is in the order of \$1,261 whereas  
24 the non-residential assessment per capita is in the  
25 order of \$1,800 or \$1,779. It is only when one breaks  
26 down on a per capita basis the residential as to non-  
27 residential assessment that you have brought home to you  
28 what we in our brief have for want of a better terminology,  
29 adopted as bill-paying capacity of assessment or quality  
30 of assessment.





1 In our submission, therefore, there is  
2 justification for the second starting point now adopting  
3 what we propound to you as a formula which, when applied  
4 to all of our boroughs, would in our submission achieve  
5 an equality of representation -- a formula predicated on  
6 the fact that we are in contemplation of populations  
7 within the boroughs, leaving apart the City, of 250,000  
8 of multiples thereof.

9 The formula that we propound to you is as  
10 set out on page 18 of our brief. It in effect divides  
11 the borough population by the multiple of 250 and  
12 multiples that result by an aggregate composition of  
13 residential assessment per capita over 1200 plus non-  
14 residential assessment per capita over 900. The figures  
15 1200 and 900 factors weight the non-residential or bill-  
16 paying capacity of assessment in favour of a new  
17 municipality, which is what we call quality of assessment.

18 This formula applied to the population and  
19 assessment figures for 1963 in the six boroughs that we  
20 proposed to you would result in a council of 16 persons  
21 of whom one half would be chosen and represent the City  
22 of Toronto and the remainder would come from the suburban  
23 municipalities.

24 Mr. Commissioner, adopting a formula of this  
25 kind in our submission to you would achieve growth of  
26 representation with not only growth of population but  
27 also growth of good development. Population growth per  
28 se would not widely vary; in fact probably would not  
29 even vary at all the representation from any borough  
30 because the multiples are worked on a per capita basis.





1 To draw a ludicrous example, if the population of a  
2 borough were multiplied by two the residential assessment  
3 per capita would not be because it would follow reasonably  
4 straight lines. Therefore, there would be an increased  
5 representation because of the vast population now re-  
6 quired to be represented, but it would not be dispro-  
7 portioned because of the building in of the bill-paying  
8 quality of the assessment per capita in the municipal-  
9 ities.

10 It is on this premise we respectfully  
11 submit to you that a federated or metropolitan form of  
12 government should continue, that it would be in the best  
13 interest of the municipalities and their inhabitants and  
14 that it could by the adoption of this formula or some  
15 modification thereof provide for growth of representation  
16 on the municipal council as it proceeded.

17 The multiple of 250, as I indicated to you,  
18 Mr. Commissioner, is somewhat arbitrarily selected  
19 except insofar as it is as close an approximation as we  
20 can get to a population borough outside the City coupled  
21 with modifications of geographic boundaries.

22 We feel that the selection of these boroughs  
23 has the added merit of containing, within each, one of  
24 the major municipalities existing today and that it  
25 therefore has the hard core of administrative personnel  
26 and experience which would permit of this modification  
27 of metropolitan government with a minimum of disruption.

28 Apart from that or the answers to any  
29 questions you may desire to put to us, I do not believe  
30 there is any merit in my seeking to repeat many of the





1 submissions which have been put to you by Mr. Allen  
2 preceeding me.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: You suggest that Highway  
4 407 would be a natural logical boundary for North York?

5 MR. CONLIN: Yes. I think that, Mr.  
6 Commissioner, because -- and I am sure you will have  
7 studied the data -- the examination of the proposed  
8 Metropolitan Toronto official plan (that is, the second  
9 step plan) reveals that the urban development in con-  
10 templation northerly from the metropolitan boundary of  
11 Steeles Avenue at the moment is largely concentrated  
12 in the southeast of Vaughan and the southwest of Markham.  
13 We believe that there is considerable justification for  
14 encompassing within the metropolitan government now that  
15 fragment of area which one can contemplate to be  
16 ultimately developed on an urban basis, thereby leaving  
17 the remainder of those municipalities in their sub-  
18 stantially rural forms without the problems that were  
19 visited upon for example, the Township of North York  
20 anteceding the corporation of Metropolitan Toronto.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: Why should 407 not also  
22 be the northern boundary of Etobicoke and Scarborough?

23 MR. CONLIN: Well, it might well be, as we  
24 examine into the development of Etobicoke as it is going  
25 on right now. The northern boundary of Etobicoke is  
26 just about the limit of the development that they have  
27 under way. There are plans that are in fact being  
28 propounded on its incorporation into the metropolitan  
29 order, the urban development of Etobicoke, and we felt  
30 there would be justification in simply creating





1 Etobicoke on its geography and on its population basis  
2 together with the Lakeshore municipalities into a single  
3 borough or municipality.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: You say, "Highway 407  
5 forms a natural geographic boundary beyond which only  
6 rural land user is contemplated or to be encouraged".

7 There is no Highway 407 at the moment is there?

8 MR. CONLIN: Not physically -- a fragment  
9 of it. The fragment of it is really a diversion of  
10 Highway No. 7 around Thornhill at the moment. It is  
11 in fact a registered line on the registry plans. The  
12 Department of Highways scheme has registered it as far  
13 as -- I think only as far as the east boundary of Vaughan  
14 and perhaps Yonge Street. I am not certain whether it  
15 is registered through Markham or not.

16 It is physically not there, but when you  
17 examine its location on the registered plans in the  
18 Registry Office and compare that with the scheme of  
19 development in contemplation as evidenced in Metropolitan  
20 Toronto draft plan proposals, it occurs to us and it is  
21 for this reason that we adopted it as being a natural  
22 boundary. As I have indicated to you there has been in  
23 the form of restricted area land user by-laws in both  
24 Markham and Vaughan and enunciation of policy to inhibit  
25 development outside that area.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: What would happen if I  
27 should recommend that the northerly boundary of North  
28 York be Highway 407 and Highway 407 is built elsewhere?

29 MR. CONLIN: I suppose I can only urgently  
30 request, Mr. Commissioner, that if you are adopting





1 my submission to you coupled with that recommendation  
2 should be "as presently contemplated" as is evidenced  
3 in the Department of Highways planning documents as at  
4 present.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you considered  
6 what might be the effects on Vaughan and Markham if the  
7 southern urbanized sections were removed from the  
8 Townships?

9 MR. CONLIN: Direct analyses of the impact  
10 upon their assessment and consequently perhaps upon  
11 their tax rates have not in fact been done -- certainly  
12 not by me. I can only make a general observation that  
13 in the area in question from personal examination the  
14 form of user of land above those limits that I described  
15 -- and again too there is a strip along Yonge Street not  
16 fully developed for the full concession all the way  
17 through to Bathurst or to Bayview, but the development  
18 beyond those limits that we propound is very sparse and  
19 is substantially of a rural municipality.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: I have visited the area;  
21 I have seen it.

22 MR. CONLIN: It is our view that the  
23 impact upon them would not be great. In fact if this  
24 area was encompassed within one of the municipalities of  
25 Metropolitan Toronto the problems presently confronting  
26 the two northerly municipalities would be taken out of  
27 their lap. They would cease to have problems which  
28 have been visited upon them by advance development, the  
29 permanent resolution of which must of necessity come  
30 from the south.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Turning to your formula  
2 for representation, which I have read a number of times,  
3 I want to put a basic question to you, Mr. Conlin. I  
4 have always believed that in a democracy the formula  
5 for representation should be understood by the average  
6 voter. Do you think the average voter would ever under-  
7 stand your formula? I am not criticizing your formula.

8 MR. CONLIN: It is very doubtful.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: One of the principal  
10 arguments used in most of the principles which have been  
11 submitted to me in favour of local government is that  
12 local government is close to the people; it is democracy.  
13 I just wonder how you overcome the problem presented by  
14 a formula such as you have submitted?

15 MR. CONLIN: If I may make a general  
16 observation, Mr. Commissioner, the formula application  
17 is in our submission to you one which has the merit of  
18 flexibility of the selection of representation on the  
19 Metropolitan Council rather than on the council of the  
20 local Municipalities as such.

21 We feel that this application -- or the  
22 application of some modified form achieving roughly  
23 the same result -- would do away and could do away in  
24 the future with the vexing problem of quoro-inter-  
25 municipality on the quantum of representation at the,  
26 if I may call it, senior levels.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: I realize, of course,  
28 you are not presenting this formula for local elections  
29 and you are not suggesting that the metropolitan  
30 councillors should be directly elected. I realize that.





1 MR. CONLIN: I understand that.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I was just wondering if  
3 you did not think that after all the voter is still  
4 interested or you want him to be interested in Metro  
5 and whether he would not be rather confused by an  
6 involved formula.

7 MR. CONLIN: As we were apprehending it,  
8 sir, in the year in which election was in contemplation  
9 the application of the formula would determine the  
10 number of representatives from each individual component  
11 municipality and that their selection would be again on  
12 the premise that was put forward by Mr. Allen. We adopt  
13 practically what he told you here; that the senior  
14 magistrate of each municipality, together with such of  
15 the next in line members of the Board of Control would  
16 be the personnel as far as the local voter is concerned.

17 It is my submission to you, sir, that taking  
18 the borough of York as an example the application of the  
19 formula would reveal to the electing public that the two  
20 representatives from York would be going to council, or  
21 the metropolitan council.

22 I look upon the application of the formula  
23 as strictly an administrative chore determining by reason  
24 of its flexibility the representation that a municipality  
25 would have.

26 -

27 -





1                   As far as the local populace is concerned,  
2                   in their elections they would be electing someone;  
3                   automatically the reeve or the mayor as the case may  
4                   be in a suburban municipality would be a representative,  
5                   and by the determination as purely an administrative  
6                   chore in the election the populace would be apprised  
7                   of the fact that from that particular municipality, one,  
8                   two or three as the case may be would be representing  
9                   at the Metropolitan level. In their selection of them,  
10                  apart from the group beyond the Board of Control at  
11                  the city, they would be elected at large within the  
12                  local municipality.

13                THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. In regard to the  
14                distinction between residential and industrial assess-  
15                ment, you want to give recognition to what you call  
16                quality of assessment which means that you would give  
17                greater recognition to commercial and industrial  
18                assessment than to residential assessment; am I  
19                right?

20                MR. CONLIN: That is correct, sir.

21                THE COMMISSIONER: I don't know if this is  
22                fair, but would you give more votes to a person who has  
23                a higher income than to one that does not pay income  
24                tax?

25                MR. CONLIN: Certainly not.

26                THE COMMISSIONER: You do not think there  
27                is any parallel here?

28                MR. CONLIN: I don't think so.

29                THE COMMISSIONER: I was just wondering  
30                because you go on to say if the population of a borough





1 were to double without capital increase in its non-  
2 residential assessment, its representation upon Metro-  
3 politan Council would not improve, so that you are  
4 departing from the principle of representation ---

5 MR. CONLIN: Strictly by population, yes.  
6 Strictly, indeed, sir. The reason therefor is the  
7 very quarrel that exists at the moment, and that the  
8 whole structure has been erected upon the financial  
9 stability of the original major municipality, namely  
10 the city. At this moment when you examine all the  
11 statistical data, if one were to adopt merely repre-  
12 sentation by population alone, the city, vis a vis it,  
13 the suburban municipalities would be overwhelmed.  
14 However, it is recognized by the municipality I  
15 represent that there is some justification in giving  
16 representation on the Council which represents the  
17 area for area-wide problems, for it is, as we call it,  
18 quality of assessment, and I frankly confess to you  
19 we worked backwards to determine the formula. There  
20 were many applications before the formula was ulti-  
21 mately hit upon. It came home to us in our examina-  
22 tion of the assessments per capita broken down to  
23 residential and non-residential, that there could be  
24 justification as at the moment based on bill paying  
25 capacity for half and half split.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I have been trying to  
27 think this through, and that is why I am asking the  
28 questions. I am not asking them in a critical way.  
29 Another thought comes to my mind: you talk of bill  
30 paying capacity, and you would weight representation





1           in favour of commercial and industrial assessment.  
2       Taxes yielded by that commercial and industrial assess-  
3       ment may, of course, or are in part paid by the citi-  
4       zens of Scarborough and North York and the other  
5       municipalities that those taxes are based on in part  
6       anyway.

7                   MR. CONLIN:    I am not sure that I follow  
8       your premise.

9                   THE COMMISSIONER:    I am just following  
10      through your distinction between residential and  
11      commercial assessments in relation to representation.

12                  MR. CONLIN:    Yes.

13                  THE COMMISSIONER:    You would give greater  
14      representation to the municipalities which have what  
15      you call quality of assessment?

16                  MR. CONLIN:    Yes.

17                  THE COMMISSIONER:    Because they have  
18      greater bill paying capacity; I think that is correct?

19                  MR. CONLIN:    Yes.

20                  THE COMMISSIONER:    You are using that term?

21                  MR. CONLIN:    Yes.

22                  THE COMMISSIONER:    My point is some of  
23      those payments, perhaps a large part of those payments,  
24      are actually made by the people living in the suburbs  
25      which have mainly residential assessment, because they  
26      buy in the stores located in the other municipalities,  
27      and certainly the real estate tax is a tax which to a  
28      large degree is passed on to the consumer.

29                  MR. CONLIN:    Oh, I understand, sir.

30                  THE COMMISSIONER:    That is another problem





1 that I envisage there.

2 MR. CONLIN: This is quite true when one  
3 looks to the source of the revenue with which the  
4 non-residential tax is paid, and the premise is well-  
5 founded.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: I am pointing out the  
7 problems. I have given a good deal of consideration  
8 to a number of proposals. Yours is the most involved  
9 I will admit, and I can see that you worked backwards.  
10 Those are all the questions I have to ask. Have you  
11 anything to read, Reeve Mould?

12 REEVE MOULD: No.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

14 MR. CONLIN: Thank you, sir.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I will now adjourn to  
16 two o'clock when North York Township will present its  
17 brief. I have just one question: when you use  
18 "borough" do you use the term "borough" for any special  
19 reason?

20 MR. CONLIN: No.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: As far as you are con-  
22 cerned it is interchangeable with "city"?

23 MR. CONLIN: City, yes, sir.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

25 ---Thereupon the hearing recessed.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 ---Upon resuming at 2.00 p.m.

2  
3 THE COMMISSIONER: Reeve Goodhead, North  
4 York.

5 SUBMISSION OF  
6 TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

7  
8 Appearances:

9 Mr. Norman Goodhead Reeve  
10 Mr. J. J. Robinette, Q.C.)  
11 Mr. Stewart Rogers, Q.C. ) Counsel  
12 Mr. M. H. Chusid Councillor

13 -----

14  
15 MR. GOODHEAD: Thank you. The submission  
16 to the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Toronto on  
17 behalf of the Township of North York will be presented  
18 by Mr. Robinette, Mr. Goldenberg, and I will be  
19 available if there are any matters which arise out of  
20 it, and I think some of our members of council will  
21 be along, so if I may, I will ask Mr. Robinette to  
22 present our brief.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You may sit  
24 beside Mr. Robinette if you want to.

25 MR. ROBINETTE: Mr. Commissioner, we  
26 listened this morning to two very interesting and able  
27 presentations. If I may say a word with respect to  
28 Mr. Allen's submissions, we entirely endorse what he  
29 said, and we accept the proposition, as he put it, that  
30 there must be in the future some form of Metropolitan





1 government in this area.

2           Unfortunately, however, as to Mr. Conlin's  
3 presentation, I must say that I disagree with almost  
4 everything he said. In the course of my presentation  
5 and analysis of our brief, I propose to deal with the  
6 salient features in his presentation.

7           I know, sir, you have read the brief, but  
8 what I propose to do is draw your attention briefly to  
9 the significant passages. We point out at the bottom  
10 of page 2 that we fully recognize the significant  
11 contribution which the scheme of government introduced  
12 by the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act of  
13 1953 made. We say, sir, "It is no overstatement to  
14 say that without the form of metropolitan government  
15 which came into force on January 1, 1954, the economic  
16 development of what is now the metropolitan area would  
17 have been stifled. It was the metropolitan govern-  
18 ment which provided the financial capacity to con-  
19 struct, amongst other services, major roads, sewers  
20 and a water supply system. The solid achievements  
21 of the metropolitan system cannot be minimized."

22           We also submit at the same time "through-  
23 out this period of extraordinary development and  
24 demand, it has achieved within the Metropolitan  
25 system a considerable degree of success in providing  
26 a satisfactory supply of municipal services within  
27 a reasonable tax structure."

28           In the next two paragraphs we have given  
29 some very brief statistics which confirm the recognized  
30 fact that today North York is one of the most rapidly





1 developing municipalities on the North American Con-  
2 tinent. We point out that in 1953 the population  
3 was about 110,000, and in 1963, about 300,000; an  
4 increase in that period of 175 per cent contrasted with  
5 Metropolitan Toronto's percentage increase of 38.4 per  
6 cent.

7 As to assessment, in 1954 the total assess-  
8 ment in the township was \$257,900,000 or 9.7 per cent  
9 of the total assessment in Metropolitan Toronto. By  
10 1962 this had increased to \$716,700,000, or 17 per cent  
11 of the total assessment in Metropolitan Toronto.

12 Now, on page 4 we point out that "since  
13 1953 certain glaring weaknesses and defects in the form  
14 of metropolitan government, combined with the tremendous  
15 growth of the Township of North York, compel the  
16 conclusion that, although basically the concept of  
17 federation should be retained, some changes are now  
18 necessary."

19 In the next paragraph we point out that it  
20 is in our view essential that local government be kept  
21 as close to the people as possible, and that the area  
22 municipalities should conduct the legislative work and  
23 practical business matters which are intimate to the  
24 ratepayers in accordance with the principles of The  
25 Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

26 We took the liberty, sir, of drawing your  
27 attention to a very brief passage from a very voluminous  
28 report by the Royal Commission on Local Government in  
29 Greater London, and that Commission which studied the  
30 problems of the Greater London area came to the





1 conclusion that "the primary unit of local government  
2 in the Greater London area should be the borough, and  
3 the borough should perform all local authority func-  
4 tions except those which could be better performed  
5 over that wider area'. At this time North York affirms  
6 the general principles of division of powers between  
7 the area municipalities and the central government in  
8 the form of the federal system contained in The  
9 Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act."

10 Now, sir, we go on to deal with the back-  
11 ground behind our first suggestion. At the present  
12 time the Township of North York has one representative  
13 on Metro Council representing over 300,000 persons;  
14 Swansea, with 9,000-odd, Weston with 10,000-odd,  
15 Forest Hill with 21,000, East York with 71,000, each  
16 has the same representation as North York on the  
17 Metropolitan Council. "The City of Toronto with  
18 642,917 persons has 12 representatives on the Metro-  
19 politan Council; thus, although Toronto's population  
20 is only slightly more than twice the population of  
21 North York, Toronto has twelve times the representation  
22 on the Metropolitan Council. The mere statement of  
23 these figures shows the injustice of the situation in  
24 relation to the ratepayers and inhabitants of North  
25 York, and it is essential that this lack of adequate  
26 representation on the Council of Metropolitan Toronto  
27 be rectified.

28 "Therefore, North York submits that the  
29 Council of Metropolitan Toronto should be appointed on  
30 a population basis so that there will be representation





1 of the area municipalities by population on the Council.  
2 Put simply, if an area municipality has three times the  
3 population of another area municipality it should have  
4 three times the representation on the Metropolitan  
5 Council. The present injustice is becoming intolerable  
6 and demands immediate rectification. Whatever may be  
7 the size of the council of Metropolitan Toronto recog-  
8 nition must be given to the principle of representation  
9 on the council by population of the area municipalities."

10 If I may stop there, sir, and deal for a  
11 moment with Mr. Conlin's suggestion this morning on  
12 behalf of the Township of York, as I understand his  
13 proposal, he says in effect that representation on  
14 the Metro Council should be on the ratio of what he  
15 calls paying assessment. That is to say, if a  
16 municipality has more industrial and commercial assess-  
17 ment than another municipality, it is entitled to a  
18 higher representation on the Metro Council. I judge  
19 when he used the expression "paying assessment" he  
20 was stating the recognized fact, I suppose, that that  
21 type of assessment is one that does not require a great  
22 deal in the way of services, or at least requires less  
23 than residential assessment.

24 Now, sir, I say with the greatest of respect  
25 to the Township of York that the suggestion that they  
26 made is a novel one but a completely unsound one. It  
27 overlooks the fact, sir, that your problem, with respect,  
28 and the problem of all of us, is to solve problems of  
29 people rather than to solve the problems of dollars  
30 and cents. It is the people in this area who are to





1 be considered and who are to make their voice effective  
2 as to the services whether they be service in the form  
3 of education or transportation services, or what you  
4 may want.

5 -

10 -

15 -

20 -

25 -





1           Each person is entitled to his say.   The  
2   very suggestion that he should have a representation  
3   on a council on the basis of a particular type of  
4   assessment is the very negation in my submission of  
5   the democratic principle.

6           I know, sir, that you appreciate that  
7   Upper Canadians are pretty good historians and I think  
8   remember George Brown and the words of George Brown  
9   are deeply imbedded in all of us, that "in this province  
10   we recognize and we have always stood for representation  
11   by population."

12           Also, in another field of interest the  
13   Supreme Court of the United States has recently taken  
14   active steps to ensure that in State and Federal  
15   elections there shall be distribution of seats between  
16   rural and urban areas so that you will have equality of  
17   representation.

18           Now, in our submission it would be completely  
19   wrong to be driven away from -- in any respect -- the  
20   concept that there should be representation by popula-  
21   tion on the Metro Council and that people should have the  
22   right to speak through their elected representatives  
23   on the democratic basis of population.

24           In our submission the suggestion contained  
25   in the brief of the Township of York should be rejected  
26   out of hand.

27           Now, sir, on page 6 we turn to the other  
28   basic problem.   I must say, sir, that we have not attempted  
29   in this brief or we have not been so presumptuous as to  
30   suggest to you definite boundaries for the Borough





1 Municipalities but we do suggest the basic principle  
2 which may be followed.

3 "The economic imbalance of the various  
4 area municipalities was the subject matter of a careful  
5 report on the Metropolitan Toronto system of government  
6 made by The Ontario Department of Economics in November  
7 of 1961. It is apparent that at the present time  
8 among the area municipalities there is an imbalance of  
9 assessment and a resulting disparity in the cost and  
10 efficiency of some services which should be corrected  
11 in any revision of the scheme of government in Metro-  
12 politan Toronto. While in 1962, the Metropolitan  
13 Toronto average assessment per capita was \$2,596,  
14 an indication of the economic imbalance is shown in  
15 that, in 1962, Leaside's assessment per capita was  
16 \$4,052, whereas East York's was \$1,787. North  
17 York's assessment per capita was \$2,502 in 1962,  
18 whereas that of New Toronto was \$3,389 and that of  
19 Forest Hill was \$3,364. This disparity in the assess-  
20 ment per capita will likely increase rather than de-  
21 crease and if the structure of Metropolitan Toronto is  
22 to survive this imbalance must be corrected as soon  
23 as possible."

24 Now, we put this view forward, sir, be-  
25 cause we are not the worst sufferers from that imbal-  
26 ance but we do feel that the stability of the whole  
27 area is equally vital to North York as to the in-  
28 habitants of the other area municipalities and we  
29 realize although North York is coming into valuable  
30 area expansion, there is imbalance and it should be





1 corrected.

2 "In order to achieve the correction of  
3 this imbalance North York submits that the area muni-  
4 cipalities should be enlarged and decreased in numbers  
5 so that there would be in the future four or possibly  
6 five units of local government hereinafter called  
7 boroughs, of which the Township of North York would  
8 be one."

9 Now, sir, you asked this morning one of the  
10 counsel whether there was any significance in the word  
11 "boroughs". There is not, of course. We have just  
12 used that as a convenient way to describe the enlarged  
13 borough of municipalities, but it seems to us, sir,  
14 that the next sentence is the key principle. "The  
15 essential matter is that in order to cure the imbalance  
16 in assessment per capita the present area municipalities  
17 should be enlarged to four or five boroughs on the basic  
18 principle that the ratios of population to assessment  
19 in the boroughs will be as close to one another as  
20 possible with geographical considerations in mind."

21 Now, with the greatest of respect, sir,  
22 it is our submission that that is the key to one of  
23 the basic problems with which you are going to have to  
24 deal. Our view is that the problem of representation  
25 and the problem of economic imbalance would be re-  
26 solved by the creation of a four or five borough system.

27 In summary, we submit that the general  
28 concept of a federal scheme in Metropolitan Toronto  
29 with a division of powers between the Metropolitan  
30 Council and the councils of the area municipalities





1 should be retained; that the best method of rectifying  
2 the economic imbalance is the enlargement of the area  
3 municipalities into four or five boroughs in each of  
4 which the ratio of population to assessment would be  
5 as reasonably close as possible.

6 In order to cure the present injustice  
7 with respect to representation on the Metropolitan  
8 Council henceforth representation on that council should  
9 be on the basis of representation by population so that  
10 areas such as North York with a large population will  
11 be adequately represented.

12 That in any event the economic imbalance  
13 shown by the disparity in per capita assessment in the  
14 present area municipalities must be rectified.

15 We also make this suggestion that the  
16 structure of the federation should be reviewed at  
17 regular five-year intervals. What we had in mind  
18 there particularly was if there were decided changes in  
19 population or assessment, there might have to be from  
20 time to time a variation in the size or boundaries of  
21 the boroughs.

22 Now, in our brief, in addition to that,  
23 we have made some suggestions as to possible changes  
24 in the division of powers between the Metropolitan  
25 Council and the area municipalities. For example,  
26 under fire fighting and ambulance service, we think  
27 that -- and the Township of North York alone is not  
28 capable -- we feel that a study should be made of the  
29 standards and organization of fire services within  
30 Metropolitan Toronto. A study should be made to





1 determine whether it would be desirable or undesirable  
2 that that be taken over by the Metropolitan Council  
3 and they should also consider what is done in some  
4 American cities, by having the police and fire and  
5 ambulance services under one head.

6 We mention, sir, emergency ambulance  
7 services. There has been some criticism in this area  
8 of delays in ambulances reaching the scene of an  
9 accident and one of the committees of our Council went  
10 to Montreal for enlightenment, sir, and studied the  
11 system introduced by the City of Montreal. As  
12 Appendix 1 to our brief, for purely informative pur-  
13 poses, we have outlined what the committee discovered  
14 in Montreal and the committee has suggested that the  
15 Metropolitan Council should study the Montreal system;  
16 under which the police use a station wagon type of  
17 vehicle for emergency ambulance work.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: If I may interrupt on  
19 that, Mr. Robinette, in Montreal that system has just  
20 been terminated for financial reasons but it was a good  
21 system.

22 MR. ROBINETTE: It was a good system,  
23 apparently.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I read that appendix,  
25 by the way.

26 MR. ROBINETTE: You are familiar with it,  
27 sir.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

29 MR. ROBINETTE: I just draw that to your  
30 attention.





1 As to library services -- we mention  
2 library services because we are satisfied that our  
3 library system is working well. We also mention this  
4 because it is purely one of the types of matters which  
5 the area municipalities can do very well.

6 We have filed as one of the appendices to  
7 our submission a report of the North York Library Board  
8 for 1963, and a perusal of that report indicates the  
9 vigour with which the educational structure is main-  
10 tained. There are four library buildings. There  
11 are four bookmobiles. There are efforts of collecting  
12 of films and magazines and study groups. In other  
13 words the library system is designed to meet the needs  
14 of a young and growing community and we feel that we  
15 should draw that to your attention as an example of  
16 the type of situation or type of endeavour which can  
17 be particularly well done by the borough.

18 Also, sir, it is important to appreciate  
19 that on such things as the Library Board you have a  
20 number of dedicated persons in the community that are  
21 giving their services in the interests of that com-  
22 munity. Mr. Allen spoke this morning of the pride of  
23 the local community as one of the reasons for retaining  
24 the area system and I think you can more successfully  
25 acquire the services, without cost, of devoted people  
26 in a smaller area of which they are proud than in a  
27 large and amalgamated city. I think that is human  
28 nature. The North York Library Board is an example  
29 of a situation where dedicated individuals have given  
30 their services in the interests of the community.





1                   Then, sir, as to planning -- we point out  
2                   that the official plan of the Metropolitan area should  
3                   be adopted but we feel each borough should have a plan-  
4                   ning organization to carry on the planning function  
5                   at the local level by means of such local official  
6                   plan as should be found necessary, local planning  
7                   studies and uniform zoning bylaws.     The system should  
8                   be such that the local planning would complement the  
9                   fundamental principles of the Metropolitan official  
10                  plan but would also permit a considerable degree of  
11                  flexibility and interpretation so as to encourage  
12                  development within the borough in conformity with the  
13                  needs of the Metropolitan area as outlined in the  
14                  Metropolitan official plan.

15                 Now, in an area as large as Metropolitan  
16                 Toronto, the Metropolitan official plan, even when it  
17                 is admitted as an official plan, can only be a guide  
18                 line.     It can state general tendencies, general views  
19                 about the use but local area municipalities still have  
20                 to fill in the gaps and that is planning at the local  
21                 level.

22                 We have filed for your information, sir,  
23                 as Exhibit 3, the Annual 1963 Report of the Planning  
24                 Department which contains a great deal of statistics  
25                 as to the growth of North York, approved subdivisions,  
26                 the work of the Planning Board and aspects of planning.

27                 In addition to that, sir, the Council a  
28                 few months retained the firm of McDonald, Currie &  
29                 Company to make a report on planning and development  
30                 procedures and controls in the Township of North York.





1 The Council itself has not dealt with the substance of  
2 the report as a matter of policy but the report does  
3 contain some very interesting suggestions as to the  
4 manner in which planning matters may be expedited and  
5 we put this as an appendix to the brief purely for  
6 information so as to suggest improvements by a well  
7 known firm of management consultants and auditors  
8 with reference to procedures in planning.

9 As to welfare, we point out that we are  
10 quite satisfied with the present position as to work,  
11 engineering, parks and recreation departments. We  
12 take the position that each borough should be respon-  
13 sible for the operation of parks and recreation  
14 department, an engineering department and works de-  
15 partment with heads of jurisdiction similar to those  
16 now existing between each area municipality and the  
17 Metropolitan corporation, subject to one exception.

18 We suggest with reference to the operation  
19 of the works department that"(a) the Metropolitan  
20 authority shall be responsible for the acquisition and  
21 operation of lands and equipment necessary to be pro-  
22 vided for all garbage disposal from within the Metro-  
23 politan area including sanitary land fill sites."

24 It is particularly sanitary land fill sites  
25 that we have in mind because they could probably be  
26 more conveniently acquired by Metro for use of several  
27 or more than one, at all events, area municipalities.

28 "(b) authority be granted to the boroughs  
29 to construct and maintain the essential services such  
30 as water mains, storm and sanitary sewers and sidewalks





1 on or under highways under the jurisdiction of the  
2 Metropolitan corporation without the necessity of ob-  
3 taining consent from the Metropolitan corporation to  
4 do so."

5 At the present time, if we want to do  
6 anything underneath an arterial highway under the  
7 jurisdiction of Metro, we have to obtain their consent.

8 Then we say generally as to construction  
9 and maintenance of traffic arteries, if the number of  
10 area municipalities is reduced to four or five and  
11 they are approximately of the same size, consideration  
12 should be given to the question whether it is necessary  
13 to continue the central ownership and responsibility  
14 for maintenance of major arterial roadways. The  
15 responsibilities for the construction and maintenance  
16 of all roadways could be modified so that the individual  
17 boroughs would be responsible for the maintenance of  
18 all roadways (except expressways) and for the con-  
19 struction of all residential and sub-arterial roadways,  
20 the central government remaining responsible for the  
21 planning and construction of major arterial roadways  
22 in accordance with traffic needs.

23 We make a brief comment, sir, on the  
24 sections of the Metropolitan Toronto Act, dealing with  
25 the Toronto Transit Commission. There is a section,  
26 it is Section 116 of the Metropolitan Toronto Act,  
27 which contemplates that the Toronto Transit Commission  
28 shall be self-sustaining. It is Section 116 of the  
29 Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1960, Chapter 260.

30 The exact language of that section is "that





1 the Commission fix the tolls and fares so that the  
2 revenue of the Commission shall be sufficient to make  
3 all transportation self-sustaining."

4 Well, sir, the realities of the situation  
5 have made that a pious hope and we suggest, for con-  
6 sistency's sake, that section of the Metropolitan  
7 Toronto Act could well be taken out because there is  
8 not the slightest likelihood of it being self-sustaining  
9 for many, many years, if ever.

10 There are other sections that have been  
11 inserted which give Metro the power to contribute to  
12 the capital cost of the TTC, giving it the power to  
13 contribute to the operating costs. Those contri-  
14 butions are being made, have to be made, so it is just  
15 unrealistic, we say, to preserve a section which says  
16 that the TTC shall remain self-sustaining. It is  
17 not self-sustaining and it probably never will be.

18 As to Building Code, we feel it is desir-  
19 able that there should be a uniform building code  
20 throughout the whole Metropolitan area and that there  
21 should be a building department in each borough to  
22 enforce and administer the Code and we have filed as  
23 an exhibit a copy of the Report of the Building  
24 Committee of the Township of North York which shows  
25 the activities of that Department during 1963.

26 Now, a word as to Health, which we regard  
27 as of some importance. In the event that there is  
28 a change in the structure and organization of municipal  
29 government in the Metropolitan area to provide for the  
30 establishment of four or five boroughs, North York is





1 of the opinion that provision should be made for a  
2 Medical Officer of Health and a local Board of Health  
3 for each of such boroughs.

4  
5  
6  
7  
8 -

9  
10  
11  
12 -

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 -

19  
20  
21  
22 -

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 -

29  
30





1 We have filed, sir, with you as the final  
2 exhibit the reports for the year 1963 of the Department  
3 of Health of the Township of North York. This again in  
4 our view is peculiarly a matter which can be done better  
5 by the area municipality.

6 A perusal of that report shows that there  
7 is in the employment of the Township some eight full  
8 time dentists, twenty-four part time dentists, free  
9 dental service to the children in the schools, a  
10 number of public health nurses and tuberculosis treat-  
11 ment. This Township is very proud of its health and  
12 medical services which are rendered to the rate payers.  
13 It is something that is intimate to the rate payers and  
14 something <sup>which</sup> in our submission is the type of thing which  
15 can be done best by the area municipality.

16 Now, sir, finally as to boundaries; as I  
17 said earlier, the Township of North York is not so  
18 presumptuous as to suggest definite changes in boundaries.  
19 All we are saying is this. With the growth of the  
20 township north some consideration should be given to  
21 the extension of the boundaries of Metro Toronto and of  
22 North York. But we are not suggesting that that should  
23 be done without some inquiry as to <sup>the</sup> effect of that on the  
24 Township of Vaughan and the Township of Markham.

25 Mr. Conlin this morning suggested that the  
26 boundary of North York henceforth should be the site  
27 of the proposed highway 407. That is a suggestion which  
28 we think is worthy of thought and consideration. But at  
29 the same time we feel that some study should be made of  
30





1 the effect on what might be left of the Township of  
2 Vaughan and the Township of Markham.

3 Mr. Conlin this morning, sir, made the  
4 suggestion that henceforth the southerly boundary of  
5 the Township of North York should be highway 401  
6 and that everything in North York south of 401 and west  
7 of Yonge Street should go to the Township of York and  
8 everything east should go to the Township of East York.  
9 So, we are emphatically and, if I may so, violently  
10 opposed to any such suggestion. It would be nothing  
11 more than a real assessment grant.

12 The fact of the matter, sir, as I am sure  
13 Mr. Conlin well knows, it is that our best industrial  
14 sites are south of 401. Our best residential area is  
15 south of 401 and if we were deprived of that North  
16 York would have a worse economic imbalance than the  
17 Township of Scarborough ever had. So, sir, we say we  
18 would not object to some straightening up of the line  
19 where it does deviate, but the principle of the retention  
20 of the general southerly boundary of North York must  
21 in our submission be retained.

22 Those are our submissions, sir. As Mr.  
23 Conlin said and I say too, I am not a member of the  
24 council. I will try to answer any questions that you  
25 might care to put to me.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: I hope neither of you  
27 said that boastfully.

28 MR. ROBINETTE: No, no -- regretfully.  
29 The Reeve is here sir.  
30





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I take it then, Mr.

2 Robinette, that you express no view on the size of the  
3 council under re-organization?

4 MR. ROBINETTE: No, sir, we do not care to  
5 express any view on that.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Or on the population  
7 base that should be used as long as there is representation  
8 by population?

9 MR. ROBINETTE: Yes. We do not think it is  
10 a matter so much of a population base. The key<sup>thing</sup> is to  
11 get the ratio of assessment to population.

12 Population in area municipalities may vary  
13 from one municipality to the other. It is the economic  
14 imbalance, the disparity in services and cost of services  
15 that we think should be secured by trying to get as  
16 close a per capita assessment in each area municipality  
17 as possible.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you instructed at  
19 all, Mr. Robinette, as to whether North York prefers the  
20 present system of appointment to the council or whether  
21 it would be interested in direct election to the council?  
22 There is no mention of this in your brief.

23 MR. ROBINETTE: No. I think generally  
24 speaking, sir, they would favour the present system of  
25 appointment to the council. You see, North York will  
26 be shortly adopting a system involving a Board of Control  
27 and the ward system, so there would be -- if I may state  
28 my own view, which I hope accurately expresses the view  
29 of the council; that is that they would prefer the  
30 retention of the system of appointment rather/direct  
than





1 election by the people.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: As far as the boundaries  
3 of the new boroughs are concerned, you make no recommenda-  
4 tion except that you do not want North York pushed north  
5 between 401 and 407?

6 MR. ROBINETTE: I do not mind, sir, about the  
7 407 if investigation shows that that is reasonable, but  
8 we do very strenuously object to the deprivation of  
9 anything south of 401.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 12 where you  
11 suggest authority be granted to the boroughs to  
12 construct and maintain the essential services on or  
13 under highways under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan  
14 Corporation, I assume that the services that you are  
15 talking about there are the services within the jurisdic-  
16 tion of the area council?

17 MR. ROBINETTE: Oh, quite so, sir, yes.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: That is, the local mains  
19 and sewers; you are not asking for a change in the  
20 metro power for tnunks, and so on?

21 MR. ROBINETTE: No. That refers to our own  
22 local distribution systems of water and sewage collection.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: On the next page you ask  
24 whether it is necessary to continue the central ownership  
25 and responsibility for maintenance of major arterial  
26 roads, suggesting that the maintenance should be transferred  
27 or could be transferred to the area municipalities.

28 Are you talking there in terms of administra-  
29 tion alone or of finance too? In other words would the  
30 area municipality be responsible for both administrative





1 and financial aspects?

2 MR. ROBINETTE: Yes. I think the Reeve has  
3 this clearly in his mind.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: Feel free to answer.

5 MR. GOODHEAD: Mr. Commissioner, the idea  
6 is to eliminate metro roads and just have metro parkways  
7 and expressways because the division of responsibility  
8 under metro roads is that metro is responsible for the  
9 actual road surface and the curbs, and all other services  
10 other than storm drainage sufficient to provide drainage  
11 to that road are a metro responsibility. Lights and  
12 sidewalks and all other responsibilities are local. It  
13 creates a tremendous problem between metro and the local  
14 municipalities trying to iron out their jurisdiction  
15 over a particular road.

16 It is our view that under a reasonable  
17 borough system which is more equalized, then the borough  
18 could be responsible in total for that road and metro  
19 could just be responsible for the total question of major  
20 arterial roads such as expressways and parkways.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: I see.

22 MR. GOODHEAD: In this way they would be  
23 planned by metro and an official plan would be required  
24 in the event of development in a specific area. The  
25 municipality would be required to provide and have  
26 control over it. This is where a fantastic problem  
27 emerges, where you have a major metro road and the  
28 access and egress off that road are a metro  
29 responsibility and the sidewalks and lights etcetera  
30





1 are a local responsibility. The Division creates  
2 fantastic problems.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: What would be the financial  
4 consequence of the change you recommend? Would it mean  
5 a larger burden on the area municipalities?

6 MR. GOODHEAD: That is right, but they would  
7 have the provincial subsidy, of course, of 50 percent  
8 in the case of roads and 80 per cent in the case of  
9 bridges.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: I have just one more  
11 question with respect to the Toronto Transit Commission.  
12 I take it that North York has no objection to Metro  
13 contributions to operating and/or capital costs of the  
14 transit Commission?

15 MR. ROBINETTE: I do not think I had better  
16 answer that because at the present time there is an  
17 action in the courts between the Township of North York  
18 and Metro Toronto which is going to the Supreme Court of  
19 Canada in which North York is taking the position that  
20 Metro had no right to order them to levy again to raise  
21 a fund to contribute to the operating costs of the  
22 Commission.

23 I think that I will just confine myself while  
24 that case is pending to the suggestion that is in the  
25 brief that this concept of the T. T. C. being self-  
26 sustaining and the section in the act referring to it  
27 is unrealistic.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: Being familiar with the  
29 action that has been taken I tried to reconcile it with  
30 the statement in this paragraph, but I will leave it as





1 it is if you prefer it that way.

2 MR. ROBINETTE: Mr. Goodhead would like to  
3 speak on that.

4 MR. GOODHEAD: I do not think it is out of  
5 the way to say that the problem basically here is that  
6 it is no longer self-sustaining and as a result the  
7 legislation should be changed. Any reasonably thinking  
8 person would come to that conclusion in the light of the  
9 circumstances.

10 A problem about subsidizing the current  
11 fare structure situation arises within the question of  
12 when it should be done and how it should be done  
13 properly and legally.

14 A matter that Metropolitan Council revealed  
15 was that of the mid-term supplementary tax rate, a  
16 supplementary levying of tax against the area municipalities  
17 which meant new tax bills and so on. We are questioned  
18 very strongly whether it is in good financial operation  
19 of a municipality to provide a supplementary tax bill  
20 and a supplementary tax levy against the rate payers,  
21 and if it is to be paid it should be adjusted to your  
22 present current budgets and stopped doing one thing and  
23 provide for another and adjust your budgets accordingly --  
24 if that is reasonable.

25 We have no objection to subsidy per se,  
26 but we do to the manner in which it was handled and we  
27 still feel very strongly that it strikes at the very  
28 heart of municipal budgeting and municipal financing  
29 when you can turn around in the middle of the year and  
30 a certain Commission requests a certain amount of money





1 and it has to be raised.

2 If the school board said that they had  
3 overspent by \$10,000,000 and they need another \$10,000,000  
4 it is mandatory that we should raise it, so then budgets  
5 would mean nothing. They could come in the middle of  
6 term and say: "We need another \$10,000,000; raise it from  
7 taxation." This throws the stability of municipal  
8 taxation right out the window and we do not think it is  
9 right or proper.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: In other words you recog-  
11 nize the need today of subsidizing the transit system  
12 both for capital and current purposes and it was really  
13 the way in which it was done and the time at which it was  
14 done to which you object?

15 MR. GOODHEAD: That is right.

16 MR. ROBINETTE: After the tax bills were  
17 delivered.

18 MR. GOODHEAD: After the tax bills were  
19 delivered it needed a complete supplementary tax levy.

20 In addition the basic point we make is that  
21 in your current budget financing once you have established  
22 a budget, you have established a mill rate, the population,  
23 the tax payer understands that that is what he is going  
24 to be charged for that concurrent year. To come along  
25 with a supplementary tax levy to industry, business and  
26 people and say, "You now have an additional tax levy",  
27 I think it throws out the total idea of financial budgeting  
28 on a current level in any municipality in the province  
29 of Ontario. This is the point of argument.

30





1 We suggest this T. T. C. situation here  
2 is no longer self-sustaining and some change has to be  
3 made. I think this is the basic problem at the metropolitan  
4 level as to the current and capital financing which is  
5 now required and which requires O.M.B. approval and  
6 every area municipality is subject to approval by the  
7 Metropolitan Corporation, and Metro has no control  
8 because this is self-sustaining. They set their rates.  
9 They do everything. The T. T. C. has complete control  
10 over their servicing requirements and we feel that if  
11 there is going to be current financing and if there is  
12 going to be capital financing then there has to be some  
13 change in the self-sustaining situation and some change  
14 in so far as the T. T. C.'s relationship with the  
15 Metropolitan Corporation is concerned. We think there  
16 is very substantial room there for further consideration.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Those are all the questions  
18 I have.

19 MR. ROBINETTE: Thank you very much.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Robinette.

21 MR. GOODHEAD: We have a couple of members  
22 of our council, Mr. Robinette and Mr. Commissioner if I  
23 may. Mr. Chusid is one member of our council and Mr.  
24 Frank Watson is also here.

25 What I think you have to bear in mind here  
26 is that the Township of North York is about average.  
27 If you compare us in the Metropolitan structure re tax  
28 rate and re tax per capita and assessment per capita  
29 and so on, I think you will find we are pretty well  
30 average; so you may wonder at North York's approach to





1 this overall situation. But it is on that basis a change  
2 one way or the other is not going to really severely  
3 affect the Township of North York because any changes  
4 that are made, we are just about in the middle of the  
5 pie and which ever way it is cut we are going to come  
6 out just about the same.

7 I think there is one other matter which we  
8 do not dwell on here too which is on a metropolitan  
9 level and which I think I should bring out. Metropolitan  
10 council has complete control over total and capital  
11 spending in the metropolitan area and yet they have no  
12 control over the amount of new assessment that is going  
13 to accrue to metro; they are ordered to pay the amounts  
14 that are required under the capital allotment.

15 An area municipality may become static and  
16 have very little redevelopment and as a result can be  
17 a weight against the entire metropolitan area over which  
18 the Metropolitan Corporation has no control.

19 The problem as we see it, sir, is that  
20 zoning by laws are a local responsibility on a local  
21 level and as a result of that the development within the  
22 area municipalities in Metro - and if you go back over  
23 the last few years you will find some very low. Even  
24 the City of Toronto has had little in the way of real  
25 investment, redevelopment and development within the  
26 central city's core and as a result their assessments  
27 have gone up very little.

28 East York is another example where it is  
29 a static municipality. There is very little development  
30 but a fantastic amount of capital dollars being spent





1 by the Metropolitan Corporation for new services to  
2 East York -- for instance, the Don Valley Parkway and  
3 that sort of situation which provides intensified usage  
4 of land in East York which were not that way prior to  
5 the installation of that service. Metro has no control  
6 over the situation.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: What would you suggest  
8 more specifically, Mr. Goodhead?

9 MR. GOODHEAD: I think the official plan  
10 has to be developed, the metropolitan official plan,  
11 and adopted and applied to all area municipalities.  
12 There has to be a situation where zoning by laws are  
13 all about the same in so far as categories and designa-  
14 tions are concerned -- requirements and as to the total  
15 overall development,-but, as our brief said, leaving  
16 some flexibility within the local area municipalities  
17 for local situations.

18 I think if we got, sir, into a very concentrated  
19 number of -- we will call them "boroughs" -- instead of  
20 the thirteen little isolated boroughs ..... For instance,  
21 Swansea says: "We do not want any change", although there  
22 are areas in there that could be developed for higher  
23 intensified usage than are being developed at the moment  
24 and the land is made that way because of metropolitan  
25 services.

26 I think the Metropolitan Corporation has to  
27 get into some control in the zoning as well as in the  
28 planning.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you suggesting a  
30 uniform zoning by law for the whole area?





1                   Mr. GOODHEAD: Yes, sir, uniform zoning  
2 by law, uniform building by law and uniform official  
3 plans, and the designation of the zoning by law should  
4 be uniform.

5                   If you say R. M. 6, everybody knows what  
6 R.M.6 is, or R.M. 1. Or if you are talking about  
7 commercial C1, C2, you get into the situation where it  
8 may be C1 B1 or C1 B4 and you have no knowledge really  
9 of the general intent of that zoning by law within the  
10 municipalities because each municipality is different.





1 I think if they were standardized and under  
2 the one situation, then again, sir, Metro would have to  
3 have some control over the zoning as well as the  
4 official plan and/or you would have to bring them  
5 into more intensified boroughs so that a borough would  
6 in itself lift itself up and redevelop and rezone  
7 itself.

8 This is a problem, which to me becomes  
9 very important, and one which Metro wrestles with  
10 from time to time, though I think if you check you  
11 will find our assessment increase averages about  
12 \$150 million and it is not sufficient to meet the  
13 increased debenture debt that arises as a result of  
14 Metro spending.

15 I think as long as we are going to have  
16 reasonable tax rates something has to be done about  
17 that. Metro has no control. It spends money or  
18 arranges for the spending of money and is unable to  
19 control the new dollars that are coming in to pay  
20 for that spending. At the Metro level I know we  
21 find this is quite a problem, so that is it.

22 I think Mr. Robinette pointed out the  
23 tax rate problem is 45 mills in Leaside as opposed  
24 to 64 in the City of Toronto which creates a problem  
25 there that is unrealistic and that is not fair I  
26 would not think to the area municipalities of Metro,  
27 and just because you live in the one area you shouldn't  
28 be paying considerably less than if you lived in  
29 another area when the total overall Metro area is one  
30 unit in so far as services and so on are concerned.





1 I thought I should bring to your attention  
2 the Metro problem because that is not generally rea-  
3 lized at the North York Township level, and it is very  
4 important that some control has to be exercised over  
5 the spending of moneys, and you must also be in a  
6 position to know how much additional revenue you are  
7 going to get.

8 If I might, sir, I don't know whether Mr.  
9 Chusid or Mr. Watson have anything they would like to  
10 add.

11 MR. M. H. CHUSID: Mr. Commissioner, with  
12 your permission I will make a very few comments. I  
13 will be very brief. I did not prepare a submission  
14 of my own and so I think you will appreciate that I  
15 certainly can speak for no one but myself as a  
16 councillor in North York.

17 I just wish to make a comment on three or  
18 perhaps four items which are mentioned in North York's  
19 official submission to you, sir. One is with respect  
20 to library service, and I would like to make a comment  
21 about planning; a small comment with respect to wel-  
22 fare, and perhaps something about ambulance service  
23 which may or may not be a sufficiently large topic to  
24 concern this particular Commission. I understand  
25 from Mr. Watson who arrived here before I did that you  
26 were good enough to indicate to Mr. Robinette perhaps  
27 that system has been scrapped in Montreal from whence  
28 we gleaned our wisdom in this respect.

29 However, perhaps I ought to leave the  
30 question of ambulance service at that until we can





1       ascertain definitely what may have happened there  
2 unless you are quite certain it has been scrapped.

3               THE COMMISSIONER:   The police chief  
4 decided it was taking too much of the policemen's time,  
5 taking them away from normal duties.   They worked out  
6 another system, but they have not been able to put it  
7 into effect because neither the provincial government  
8 nor the municipal government wants to pay the cost.

9               MR. CHUSID:   Money is the root of all  
10 evil, even here.   Thank you very much, Mr. Goldenberg.  
11 With respect to library service I would only ask that  
12 you, sir, refer, if you have not already, to the  
13 Shaw Report which was prepared by Doctor Shaw a  
14 number of years back for the Metropolitan government  
15 here and which the Council of the Township of North  
16 York has considered within this past year, and has  
17 chosen not to commend it to you as at least some sort  
18 of basis for the extension of library services within  
19 Metro Toronto.

20               I am particularly concerned with the  
21 reference it makes, and I am in respectful agreement  
22 to the reference it makes to the Central Reference  
23 Library system for the whole of the Metro area, Central  
24 Library card system, and so on.   In other words, a  
25 greater centralization of many of the uses, facilitates  
26 offered by library service as is possible, and not  
27 confining it to the borough or to the smaller municipal  
28 system.

29               With respect to planning, I would like to  
30 make a comment which is perhaps in a way based upon Mr.





1 Goodhead's comment that he was concerned that the funds,  
2 the debenture funds for development within Metro have to  
3 be raised and are raised by the Metro government but  
4 that Metro has no control over the actual zonings and  
5 rezonings and the local development that takes place  
6 which is the basis upon which the moneys can be ob-  
7 tained in order to repay these debenture loans.

8           However, our Council has not gone, in my  
9 opinion, far enough in suggesting to you, sir, that  
10 planning should be more centralized within the Metro  
11 area. I think that Mr. Goodhead has suggested that  
12 the nomenclature of the various planning bylaws ought  
13 to be fused so that when someone says R2, RM6, or whatever  
14 it may be, it means the same thing in East York as it  
15 does in Toronto or North York, and I think it ought  
16 to go farther than that, if I may respectfully suggest  
17 to you, sir, and that is that a far greater control  
18 over the planning designations should be held at the  
19 Metro level with the individual municipalities or  
20 boroughs offering advice to the central level on the  
21 question of planning rather than deciding these  
22 questions at their level subject only to the Ontario  
23 Municipal Board.

24           With respect to welfare, the comment I wish  
25 to make ---

26           THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me, what would  
27 be the function of the local planning organization  
28 which your brief recommends? You say you favour a  
29 Metro-wide official plan but each borough should have  
30 a planning organization to carry on the planning





1 function at the local level by means of such local  
2 official plans as may be found necessary, local  
3 planning studies and uniform zoning bylaws. What  
4 would be the function?

5 MR. CHUSID: The function that I believe  
6 is contemplated by North York's submission is similar  
7 to the function that exists today, which is that the  
8 planning application comes in the first instance to  
9 the Planning Board of the local municipality, then  
10 to its particular council, and then on to the Ontario  
11 Municipal Board, and on the way it is dealt with by  
12 the Metro Planning Board for certain Metro aspects.  
13 In fact the real argument, the ratepayers, everyone  
14 appears at the local level; that is, of North York at  
15 the North York council chamber, and we make a decision  
16 which then goes to the Ontario Municipal Board.

17 I would suggest, rather, that we act in  
18 a more advisory capacity. The local level act in an  
19 advisory capacity; it retain its planning staff; it  
20 retain the function of advising the Metro level as  
21 to what it thinks ought to be done with a particular  
22 municipality or in that particular portion of the  
23 municipality because its planning staff, its planning  
24 board -- if we retain the local planning board -- but  
25 certainly its planning staff and its politicians  
26 know best what the immediate local problem is, and  
27 ought so to advise the Metro Planning Board and the  
28 Metro decision maker. But that is as far as it goes.  
29 Then it is up to the Metro level which becomes  
30 appealable to the Ontario Municipal Board. I am





1 suggesting really a more advisory capacity than it is  
2 today.

3 With respect to welfare, my only comment  
4 there is that I recognize that the Province of Ontario  
5 has extended the mandatory welfare payment requirements.  
6 I believe it was as of January 1st of this year, and  
7 the Township of North York indicates that it is satis-  
8 fied with this arrangement, and the cost of the basic  
9 services by which I think we mean the mandatory ones  
10 are to be financed by Metro Council and optional  
11 services to be rendered and financed by borough  
12 government.

13 My suggestion here is that there should be  
14 some indication from you, sir, as to the possibility  
15 of extending the optional services so that they will  
16 be more or less mandatory services. It is in this  
17 field of optional services, I suggest, where the  
18 greatest differences occur between what is provided  
19 by, say, the old and the perhaps more sophisticated  
20 City of Toronto and the newer suburbs. It is not  
21 mandatory service, and I am suggesting there should  
22 be some investigation as to the possibility of requiring  
23 more of these services to be mandatory so that welfare  
24 services throughout the Metro area will be closer in  
25 type and kind.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: That in fact is not  
27 a matter for decision of the Metro Council; that is  
28 provincial legislation.

29 MR. CHUSID: Yes. I am suggesting if  
30 you feel that is within the purview of your powers to





1 make that recommendation. Thank you for hearing me,  
2 particularly when I have not presented a brief to you.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.

4 MR. GOODHEAD: I would like to say you  
5 can appreciate our brief was not unanimous in some  
6 respects. About eight to one. We have nine members  
7 of council. Mr. Chusid. That is why I thought he  
8 should give you his views at the same time, seeing hs  
9 is here, and we do thank you very much for the oppor-  
10 tunity of speaking to you today.

11 MR. ROBINETTE: Thank you very much.

12 ---Short recess.  
13

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Town of Weston, Mayor  
15 Bull.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





SUBMISSION OF  
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF WESTON

Appearances:

Mayor G. W. Bull

Mr. C. W. Boddington, Councillor

-----

MR. BULL: Mr. Commissioner, I am having Mr. Boddington, our Finance Chairman, present our brief today. He has been chairman of the committee which studied the matter and prepared the brief, so I would like to introduce now Councillor Wesley Boddington. C. W. are his initials.

THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Boddington.

MR. BODDINGTON: I think you appreciate, Mr. Goldenberg, that there is some difficulty involved in following Mr. Robinette and Mr. Goodhead. However, it is a privilege to present our brief.

Geographically, Weston is located at the apex of a funnel formed by the Humber River valley. This valley has its beginnings thirty miles to the northwest in the vicinity of Caledon East, thirty-five miles to the north in the Holland Marsh, and in the Aurora highlands east of Yonge Street.

In much the same way that water funnels to this area, people have funnelled to Weston for social activities, commerce, recreation, worship and hospitalization since the latter part of the eighteenth century. People from Weston have become famous in





1 many endeavours. With all due deference to you, sir,  
2 I might mention that Bob Pulford is a native son of  
3 Weston.

4 Since, however, we are concerned here with  
5 politics and politicians, I would like to underline our  
6 contention in the brief that smaller municipalities  
7 produce politicians who would not otherwise have had  
8 an opportunity to serve. As I think of those who  
9 were and are around me in the four years that I have  
10 been in political life, I cannot think of one man who  
11 would have entered the field of politics if he had  
12 to expend great sums of money to attain office. I  
13 can, however, think of quite a few who are of such  
14 calibre that they would be very much at home in the  
15 highest levels of government. Indeed, our last three  
16 mayors in my humble opinion are capable of holding  
17 cabinet rank.

18 We think that because Weston has done its  
19 job well, because Weston has always provided services  
20 to anyone within reach, because Weston is still pro-  
21 viding services to an area far greater than its con-  
22 fines, because the people within these areas identify  
23 themselves with Weston, that Weston should be retained  
24 as a political community within this great Metropolitan  
25 Toronto.

26 Although we are pleased to be part of  
27 Metropolitan Toronto, we would submit that smaller  
28 municipalities have carried their share of the cost  
29 without all of the direct benefits enjoyed by the town-  
30 ships. Metro has allowed townships to grow from





1 predominantly rural to suburban districts through its  
2 control of finance, the hard core service. Weston  
3 is supplying all of the needed services including  
4 social or soft core service still to come to some parts  
5 of the other townships.

6 We cannot quarrel with the fact that Metro  
7 has been a good government and a very successful con-  
8 cept. We do claim some responsibility in the growth  
9 of the area around Weston, and would be willing to  
10 assume political responsibility if it is in your  
11 opinion for the general good. If this municipality  
12 with its great feeling of community, with its obvious  
13 record in any field under scrutiny were to be attached  
14 to any of the elephantine municipalities, there would  
15 still be in the neighbourhood of fifty thousand people  
16 identify themselves with Weston. There would still  
17 be a Weston arena, a Weston area swimming pool and  
18 a centre of commerce known as Weston. There would  
19 still be a Weston postal area and a Weston Road.  
20 There would still be a 340-bed hospital whose begin-  
21 nings in 1949 were long years ahead of other Metro  
22 municipalities, and in my opinion there would be many  
23 thousands of people out of touch with their repre-  
24 sentatives and no longer interested enough to exercise  
25 their franchise.

26 If, on the other hand, you recommend that  
27 this municipality continue to play its part or to  
28 play a greater part in serving those who are already  
29 in the Weston sphere of influence, we feel that you  
30 will have added strength to the municipality of Metro





1 Toronto without leaving any of the qualities as repre-  
2 sented by the municipality of the Town of Weston.

3 I would like to thank you very much, sir,  
4 for the opportunity of appearing here. One or  
5 two comments regarding Mr. Robinette's submission: he  
6 stated that you can secure services, I think voluntary  
7 services, easier in the small areas than in the large  
8 areas. This is exactly our contention. Of course,  
9 as far as the municipality of Weston is concerned we  
10 did build an arena, a hospital, a swimming pool, without  
11 attaching tax dollars except in the form of small grants,  
12 so that there is nothing in Weston in the way of soft  
13 core services that are a burden at this time on the  
14 taxpayer.

15 We too, of course, disagree with Youk  
16 Township in thinking that they should move up to  
17 407 Highway. I would be very pleased to answer any  
18 questions, sir.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I can understand how  
20 desirable Weston is not only from what you said but  
21 from the fact that I have had two suggestions about  
22 Weston already. The first, that North York would like  
23 it, and the second, that York would like it. You do  
24 not express any preference along those lines.

25 MR. BODDINGTON: We feel, sir, that we  
26 have been responsible to a lot of people over the years,  
27 and are still serving them, who are of course at this  
28 time in Etobicoke, North York and York.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I have read your  
2 brief with interest. I really only have one question  
3 and that relates to a statement you make on page 7.  
4 It is the third sentence of the first full paragraph  
5 on that page. You say: "Again, if one municipality  
6 has permitted residential construction to out-pace  
7 commercial and industrial construction, why should  
8 the citizens of another where a strict control was  
9 exercised, be penalized?"

10 Are you suggesting there that municipali-  
11 ties which are largely residential did something wrong  
12 or acted or pursued wrong policies and that is a reason  
13 why they may be in some financial difficulties?

14 MR. BODDINGTON: No. I think, sir, that  
15 we are suggesting more that if in their freedom of  
16 choice they decided they wanted their area to be  
17 completely residential, as is the case in I think one  
18 area in Metropolitan Toronto, that, after all, was  
19 their choice and they should have the right to pay  
20 higher taxes because of that where, on the other hand,  
21 if another municipality decided that its area must  
22 be controlled then they should have the benefit of the  
23 lower tax rate.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I see what you mean.

25 MR. BODDINGTON: This goes along in our  
26 submission about the competition amongst the munici-  
27 palities. It is the same general idea. If you  
28 equalize, as far as we are concerned, all the  
29 municipalities, it is much like a welfare state and  
30 no one would be starting to better their tax rate or





1 their position.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Good. You do favour  
3 equalization of areawide services such as the services  
4 presently performed by the Metropolitan corporation.

5 MR. BODDINGTON: Oh, yes. I think  
6 that anything that cannot be well done by municipalities  
7 should be done on a very wide basis, but the things that  
8 can be done by the municipalities should be done by the  
9 municipalities.

10 I think in some ways Metro might have gone  
11 too far as it is. For instance, we have no way under  
12 the Police Act of enforcing our bylaws. It may be  
13 that Weston should still have a police force in some  
14 form.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Have you anything to  
16 add, Mayor Bull?

17 MR. BULL: Yes, I would like to make a  
18 brief comment on the business of rep by pop, which is  
19 so far out of line apparently from some of the sub-  
20 missions.

21 In my experience on Metro Council I think  
22 the representatives from the smaller municipalities  
23 have done very good work in running and I think that  
24 for two reasons. One is that we are used to a large  
25 degree of independent thought. We come to these  
26 problems which do not affect us perhaps quite as  
27 closely as some of the larger ones, and we are able  
28 to take the broad view of the situation.

29 I think too we have been a sort of buffer  
30 perhaps between the giants, you might say where there





1 might have been an absolute stalemate. The smaller  
2 municipalities with their overall viewpoint have helped  
3 quite a bit in the overall achievements of Metro-  
4 politan Council. They have taken their part cer-  
5 tainly as chairmen of various committees and so on,  
6 and the individual members have given quite a degree  
7 of leadership. However, trying to get back to the  
8 idea of what was in the men's minds originally when  
9 they conceived this thing, I think it was really  
10 brilliant that they brought this direct representation  
11 in. I think that the smaller municipalities have  
12 contributed a great deal to the actual running and  
13 would continue to do so.

14 This is, I think, a point very worthy of  
15 consideration. I also like the idea of the direct  
16 representation. This point was mentioned before in  
17 the other submission and our own experience is that  
18 it has been very valuable because having representation  
19 directly on Council I can go back and get the views of  
20 my own members and explain the various things to them  
21 so that they feel they are really part of the central  
22 government.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: You are saying, if I  
24 understand you correctly, that you do not see anything  
25 wrong with a system of representation under which Weston  
26 with ten thousand people has the same representation as  
27 North York with more than three hundred thousand.

28 MR. BULL: No, I don't think there is too  
29 much wrong with it. You must look to the achievements  
30 of Metro under this. I realize representation by





1 population is a basic premise in government but it is  
2 certainly not practised in all places.

3 As long as these representatives are  
4 responsible people, I do not see that it has caused  
5 any difficulty. There is no one who has suffered under  
6 this representation and as I say, as a buffer perhaps  
7 to the giant, we have really done a lot of good there  
8 and should continue to do so.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Of course, this is  
10 the sytem of voting in the United Nations General  
11 Assembly.

12 MR. BULL: Yes. There is lots of pre-  
13 cedence for the continuation.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Those are the only  
15 questions I have. Thank you very much.

16 We shall now adjourn to ten o'clock tomorrow  
17 morning when the Township of Scarborough will present  
18 its brief.

19  
20 ---Whereupon the hearing adjourned at 3.30 p.m.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30



# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

### HEARINGS

HELD AT

PARLIAMENT BUILDGS.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No. 1 DATE:

2 APRIL 22, 1964.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS  
ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1  
2  
3 ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO  
4

5  
6 Hearings of the Royal Commission  
7 on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
8 the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
9 Ontario, on Wednesday, April 22nd,  
10 1964, commencing at 10:00 a.m.,  
11 et seq.

12 COMMISSION:  
13

14 H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.	Commissioner
15 F. H. Finnis	Secretary
16 L. Feldman	Research Officer
17 T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant

18  
19  
20  
21

22 \* \* \* \* \*





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH	96 - 145
TOWN OF NEW TORONTO	146 - 176
THE TOWN OF MIMICO	177 - 194
THE CORPORATION OF THE VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH	195 - 215

\* \* \* \* \*





1 THE COMMISSIONER: We will proceed with  
2 the Scarborough brief. Reeve Campbell. As you are  
3 aware I have read the brief and it is not necessary  
4 for you to read the whole brief. You might summarize,  
5 add anything that you want to add and read any part  
6 you desire, but I have read it and analysed it. You may  
7 stand or sit, whichever you prefer.

8  
9 SUBMISSION OF  
10 THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF SCARBOROUGH

11 Appearances:

12 Mr. C. E. Onley	Deputy Solicitor
13 Mr. A. M. Campbell	Reeve
14 Mr. G. R. Youngs	Councillor
15 Mr. E. O. Gerrow	Councillor
16 Mr. G. Barker	Councillor
17 Mr. K. Mallette	Councillor
18 Mr. R. W. White	Deputy Reeve
19 Mr. C. A. Tripp	Clerk
20 Mr. J. E. Prudham	Treasurer

21  
22 -----  
23  
24 MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Charles Onley, our  
25 Deputy Solicitor, will take the lead in going over the  
26 points in the brief, and we can fit ourselves in wherever  
27 you see fit.

28 MR. ONLEY: If I may introduce the rest  
29 of the representatives from Scarborough. In addition  
30 to Reeve Campbell, Deputy Reeve White, Councillor Barker,





1 Councillor Mallette, Councillor Youngs, Councillor  
2 Gerrow, our Clerk Mr. C. A. Tripp and Mr. J. E. Prudham,  
3 our Treasurer. We have come well fortified here.

4 As you will have noticed from the brief,  
5 Mr. Chairman, the first part or the major part of our  
6 brief deals with the principle of local government as  
7 such. We consider that one of the issues here is  
8 whether there is to be continuation of the basic  
9 federated system that we now have or its abandonment  
10 in favour of total amalgamation.

11 We have caused to have done considerable  
12 research, and you will note that we go back a con-  
13 siderable distance to show just what local government  
14 has meant in years past.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I notice you even  
16 use Plato's statistics.

17 MR. ONLEY: Yes, sir. I would that they  
18 were of the assistance now that they were then. Coming  
19 forward to the twentieth century experience, we have  
20 concluded from our studies that as is the case in the  
21 prime experience of Metropolitan London, the highest  
22 number that anyone has suggested for a valid local  
23 government has been in the range of 500,000 persons,  
24 and that in the case of the local government, this  
25 was finally determined at some 250,000. We recognize  
26 this represents a very wide range, but we submit that  
27 the principle that there be a local government, which,  
28 in short, can be defined, if you will, as a unit of  
29 government in which the persons who are governed have  
30 a knowledge of their association with it, it is not of





1 such a large size that they will not be responsive to  
2 it whether for good, or if they don't like any matter,  
3 they can respond to offer assistance to its council.  
4 They have a sense of responsibility as members of  
5 this local governmental unit, and they can readily  
6 identify themselves with this governmental unit.

7 The head unit of local government is, of  
8 course, the council, and we consider to attract those  
9 who should be members of council, and through council  
10 its many subsidiary boards, it is necessary that that  
11 unit be not so large that they cannot feel a participa-  
12 tion in it.

13 It is our considered view that if we have  
14 a governmental unit comprising the many hundreds of  
15 square miles of what is now Metropolitan Toronto, it  
16 would be most difficult to attract those very necessary  
17 persons to give up of their time to participate in it.  
18 It becomes so big that it becomes difficult if not  
19 impossible to say "Well, that is my responsibility.  
20 I am a citizen of this governmental unit."

21 It is our considered view that basically  
22 the matter we consider most important is the recognition  
23 of a governmental unit in the terms that I have indi-  
24 cated. Our submission on the size is not precise as  
25 to numbers, but we do say that the maximum number is  
26 somewhere in the half million person category.

27 Turning now to the second part of our brief,  
28 I think it would be of assistance to the Commission to  
29 say just what happened in Scarborough. The same  
30 happened to a greater or lesser degree in North York.





1 We were faced, however, with some very particular pro-  
2 blems. There was the well-known population explosion.  
3 I suggest that a key time to consider is the few years  
4 before the actual formation of Metro.

5 As you will note, we were in a very good  
6 condition with respect to some of the major municipal  
7 services, particularly water supply. We were  
8 accommodating the very expensive matter of sewer  
9 disposal. By a topographical good fortune, our  
10 drainage area comes through the Highland Creek and  
11 gave an economical and fairly simple means of picking  
12 up sewage disposal.

13 We had many problems, and the major problem  
14 was the matter of schools, of course, because they  
15 represented such a large capital outlay over a long  
16 period of time that unless we had the assessment  
17 base to accommodate it we would have difficulty and  
18 were in fact having difficulty selling our debentures.  
19 But if one were to look at it from a very selfish  
20 point of view with Scarborough just as a municipality  
21 and not a part of this federation, the answer to it  
22 was very simple. It is well known that subdivisions  
23 can be deemed premature if services are not available  
24 by way of sale of debentures for schools and sewers,  
25 and the development would stop until discipline of  
26 the market place, if you will, stated that, yes, you  
27 can borrow some money.

28 However, in the Metro area, part of its  
29 strength and the greatest single strength was its  
30 people, and there were more coming in. The central





1 core had great financial and business and industrial  
2 institutions to offer employment. We had the  
3 large tracts of land easily and economically serviceable.

4 We opposed, as was indicated, annexation  
5 hearings. We were concerned about many capital  
6 items, but particularly the matter of school costs.  
7 It is interesting to note that the Cumming Report  
8 dealt specifically with this when it stated its  
9 specific recommendation that the Metro Council would  
10 finance all capital expenditure for school buildings  
11 and so on.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Up to an adequate  
13 standard.

14 MR. ONLEY: Yes, up to an adequate  
15 standard, and in fact Scarborough has I think in every  
16 case constructed its schools below the maximum standard  
17 cost. That specific recommendation was one of  
18 the reasons Scarborough Council acquiesced in the  
19 formation of Metropolitan government. We saw this  
20 as our big single problem. I don't want to over-  
21 emphasize it as being the only problem, but it was  
22 the largest single one and the easiest one to define.  
23 It is very difficult to say how much it is going to  
24 cost for this mile and a half of sewer when we are  
25 only going to build half a mile this year and a  
26 quarter of a mile next year, and depending on some-  
27 thing, something else is going to happen. It is very  
28 easy to isolate the cost of schools to the amount of  
29 classrooms, number of pupils that will be acquired by  
30 surveys, and we don't want the impression to be taken





1 that we are flogging the dog, if you will, of school  
2 costs, but it is symptomatic of the problem, and is a  
3 major portion of the problem.

4 So in harmony with the principle of the  
5 two-tier system with which we concurred and the taking  
6 over of the trunk service, and we consider one of  
7 the services in its overall sense would be capital  
8 school costs. It is also a provincial respon-  
9 sibility under the British North America Act. It is  
10 a provincial-wide problem. It has been gone into  
11 by the province in great detail. We felt that was  
12 going to be fairly and adequately dealt with, and so  
13 we entered into the Metro experience.

14 Turning now then to just what happened as  
15 far as the formation of Metro some ten years ago, it  
16 is our considered view that the major problems that  
17 have occurred have resulted from certain specific  
18 recommendations in the original report not being  
19 carried forward. One of these major ones is schools.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you say that it  
21 had been carried forward more recently?

22 MR. ONLEY: Yes, I will come to that if I  
23 may, and I have some figures on that.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: I am glad.

25 MR. ONLEY: Dealing for the moment with  
26 what happened to Scarborough in the first ten years,  
27 in 1954 the capital debt was taken over, but by this  
28 year we had over \$20 million in capital debts for  
29 schools. The capital debt was a matter that I think  
30 can be brought into focus when it is related to some





1 of the statistics which we have shown on page 14 of  
2 the brief.

3 I don't want to labour you with long ones,  
4 but I think the ones here are quite significant.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Everyone of them is  
6 significant.

7 MR. ONLEY: Yes, sir. Remembering that  
8 at the time of the formation of Metro<sup>as</sup> the third lowest  
9 of any of the municipalities -- only Etobicoke and  
10 North York had lower debts -- although we had problems  
11 they were relatively lower problems.

12 When we look at our assessment per person,  
13 sir, in 1954 we note that it is only \$200 below what  
14 the average was. By 1962 instead of being only some  
15 \$200 below, we were over \$600 below the average.  
16 Many factors contributed to this. Two of the major ones  
17 are these. For various reasons we attracted more of  
18 the low-cost housing. We assumed the burden of supply-  
19 ing what is called low-cost housing in the single  
20 family dwelling sense of that term. Therefore in-  
21 stead of each unit contributing sufficient assessment  
22 to carry its load in the municipality, it was not able  
23 to do so. That is not the fault of the people that  
24 moved in, and I submit it is not the fault of the Town-  
25 ship of Scarborough. These housing units had to be  
26 supplied, and we did the job.

27 The second major reason for the deteriora-  
28 tion in the relative position in the assessment per  
29 person was that our industrial assessment was not  
30 increasing at the rate that our residential assessment





1 was increasing. We were caught both ways. We have  
2 attracted many fine excellent industries. The problem  
3 is simply we have not attracted enough of them. I  
4 suggest, as it has been indicated before you before,  
5 one of the major reasons is industry in this Metro-  
6 politan area naturally attracts itself or has  
7 attracted itself more to the west where there is  
8 density of population, and the northwest, and I think  
9 you have heard it said that the influence of the air-  
10 port is a major factor in the location of industry.

11 We have seen in the past year or two  
12 particularly a most refreshing increase in industrial  
13 assessments. This can be for various reasons. One  
14 of them I think is the excellent labour pool and  
15 comparatively low cost service land. There is  
16 flexibility of travel due to the expressways, and so  
17 on, so our position is increasing, is bettering now,  
18 but we have gone through a period and will continue  
19 to go through a period where our industrial commercial  
20 ratio is not sufficiently high to on its own pick up  
21 the deficiency, if you will, in assessment costs of  
22 the low cost housing.

23 It is interesting to note too that all  
24 these various statistics all seem to be whipsawed  
25 against us. We increased our industrial commercial  
26 assessment by 5 per cent. Other larger municipalities  
27 increased it by double and more than that. Our  
28 population increase by percentage was the highest by  
29 a considerable amount. One hundred and ninety-two  
30 per cent increase in ten years against 160 per cent





1 in North York and 135 in Etobicoke.

2 Our percentage of school age population  
3 is the highest, 43 per cent, as against the next highest  
4 with 40 per cent. Our assessment for public school  
5 debt in 1960 you will note is very low for the reasons  
6 previously indicated. I think it is to the consider-  
7 able credit of the local council, school board and all  
8 those who were involved in this complex matter of  
9 local government that our local debt which is the only  
10 debt over which we have absolute control is at a  
11 very favourable level to the other comparative  
12 municipalities. In 1962, the latest figures which  
13 are available, it was \$177 against North York's \$163  
14 and Etobicoke's \$188.

15 For your information on the next page the  
16 percentages of school population and assessment I  
17 think bring out some interesting but not extreme  
18 examples. What I think is interesting and very  
19 significant is the matter of what has happened to  
20 the percentage of elementary school costs that have  
21 been paid. Remembering that school capital cost was  
22 one of the major issues before us and before the  
23 Municipal Board when the Cumming Report was being pre-  
24 pared, you will note that in the six years referred  
25 to in that report the local municipality <sup>share</sup> / has increased  
26 by 38 per cent, whereas the province and Metro have  
27 each gone down, by pure coincidence, an equal amount  
28 of 19 per cent each.

29 Again our difficulty has been compounded  
30 by the fact that Scarborough was the first municipality





1 which introduced the principle of having a trunk sewer  
2 levy charge. This was considered before the formation  
3 of Metro as a means of paying part of the cost of the  
4 sewer disposal plant. The plant, of course, was taken  
5 over by Metro, and in the intervening time we have paid  
6 Metro over \$4 million. That is a fairly considerable  
7 sum, the cash sum out of the cost of houses,  
8 if you will.





1                   A municipality that is not developing  
2 and does not have the availability of making these  
3 charges, but still when redevelopment is increasing the  
4 density and the need for rebuilding services, is not in  
5 a position to make the contributions. We are not  
6 criticizing these municipalities, but I think it is  
7 important to note that we are one of the ones that did.  
8 This \$4,000,000 could have gone a long way in our capital  
9 net position in the budget.

10                   It is recognized, and I think generally,  
11 that Scarborough has a local government in the full  
12 sense of the word. We have all those varieties of things  
13 that contribute towards a municipality. Just last week  
14 we were starting the Scarborough Philharmonic. These  
15 are some of the things that are more important possibly  
16 than the sheer dollars -- the fact that people in attune  
17 with their consideration of a municipality do all those  
18 many things that, with the assistance of Council in  
19 providing some of the facilities for them to work and  
20 the assistance of the school board in a similar way and  
21 financial assistance where necessary, they can bring  
22 them forward to make it a very pleasant community in  
23 which to live.

24                   Next, this matter of our experience in  
25 Metro up to the present time, the ten years, one of  
26 our major problems has been the matter of planning. We  
27 have in Scarborough what was one of the first official  
28 plans prepared in accordance with clear terms of  
29 reference set out in the Planning Act. We have shown  
30





1 in the brief just how the frame work of that plan is  
2 established. As you know, our official plans and all  
3 the things that flow from it -- the zoning by laws, the  
4 capital works and so on -- must be made to conform with  
5 the metropolitan official plan when and if it is passed,  
6 and yet we are faced today, ten years after the formation  
7 of Metro, with no Metro official plans.

8 We are doing our best but we are operating  
9 without the Metro frame work of an official plan which  
10 we consider a most necessary point.

11 One of the greatest necessities in the  
12 Metropolitan official plan and the planning processess  
13 that follow it is for there to be a phasing either in  
14 time or in area and a priority. From this one can co-  
15 ordinate the development. We have done this to what  
16 we consider a great successful degree in our area of  
17 phasing redevelopment.

18 In the metropolitan sense notwithstanding  
19 the wonderful progress that has been made in some areas  
20 there are major areas of lack of co-ordination which are  
21 causing us big problems. We are not saying these are  
22 little ones that Council is going to have to spend a few  
23 minutes considering. These are ones that affect millions  
24 of dollars in capital investment by the township.

25 The example we give of a trunk sewer being  
26 available for serving several hundreds of acres next year  
27 and no road access of any size at least for ten years puts  
28 Council in a most difficult position. It is most difficult  
29 to say to a developer: "No, you cannot go ahead because  
30





1 the road access is not to good." It is not a case of  
2 saying: "There is no sewer; you cannot go ahead. Council  
3 is not the one that controls developers; they guide them.  
4 They control it to a degree. But it is most difficult  
5 for our Council to be in a position where most of the  
6 services are available but some of the ones that are most  
7 important are not there. It will tax our local roads.  
8 We will have to make other specific arrangements.

9 But this is given as an example of the  
10 importance of there being an official plan prepared in  
11 accordance with the clear and defined principles of the  
12 Planning Act of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

13 Another area that has given us some concern  
14 is in the matter of police. Our police have done a  
15 good job in many areas, but it seems to be forgotten  
16 sometimes that it is the Council that is responsible for  
17 the laws and under the Council its various civil servants  
18 implement those laws -- and one of the sets of civil  
19 servants is the police.

20 We are not seeking any favouritism on the  
21 part of one or more members who are involved with the  
22 police, but we say that for an efficient function in the  
23 federation concept of government and in the basic  
24 organization of any business there should be the authority  
25 where the responsibility lies. What has been our experience  
26 is that in the one area of the police with which we are  
27 most familiar, which is traffic, we do not go through  
28 the district chief. We go through the traffic inspector.  
29 If I were a member of council I would think -- and I  
30





1 am sure the Council agree -- that if I want to talk to  
2 the police force I want to talk to the boss, the District  
3 Chief.

4 We consider it a difficult area of adminis-  
5 tration when there is a stratafication down through the  
6 organization and instead of your going to the District  
7 Chief along comes this District Inspector of Traffic who  
8 comes down from the Metro Police Force downtown. We are  
9 not criticizing the downtown operation but we say there  
10 could be a far better and far more efficient operation  
11 and function if the District Chief and his staff are more  
12 attuned to the local government.

13 There have been some unfortunate experiences  
14 with our Toronto Police in the last few years. I  
15 remember as a child in Toronto that the police force was  
16 known as Toronto's finest. I have not heard that phrase  
17 used for ten years at least. I think one of the reasons  
18 it was Toronto's finest was because of the fact that they  
19 were the local police force.

20 I suggest that part of the difficulty of the  
21 police force and certainly part of the difficulty that  
22 council is faced with is the fact with amalgamation of  
23 the police forces they became such that they lost too  
24 much of their character as local civil servants  
25 enforcing the by laws of the Council and of the Traffic  
26 Act and of the Criminal Code.

27 In addition to these problems of planning  
28 and police there are three other areas where we consider  
29 we have problems. I am now at page 19. They consist  
30 of representation, financing (which we have





1 mentioned previously) and licencing..

2 It is interesting to note that the formation  
3 of the Metropolitan Council in 1954 had 24 members and  
4 was a composition that had been specifically considered  
5 and specifically rejected in the Cumming Report. They  
6 specifically recommended against there being a formation  
7 of council in the very way that it was formed.

8 We consider that -- and we will deal with  
9 this in our recommendations -- there needs to be a form  
10 of representation that is in proportion; we do not say  
11 right to the person, but in proportion to the population  
12 of the area.

13 Financing; in addition to the matters  
14 previously referred to and the financing of education --  
15 and I will deal with the matter recently covered of  
16 capital costs, which has just occurred in the last few  
17 days in a moment-again Scarborough was caught in a  
18 whipsaw. As you know, the rather complicated basis of  
19 grants by the Province for education is on the principle  
20 that a municipality with a low assessment per class room  
21 receives a proportionately higher grant in order that  
22 there be an equality of educational opportunities across  
23 the province.

24 We have a low assessment rate. Therefore,  
25 we should have, if these grants were carried forward and  
26 the principle on which they were first paid to Metro, we  
27 should have received proportionately higher grants from  
28 Metro in the same manner as they have been received from  
29 the province. In the first place the capital costs paid  
30 out by Metro were up to an unrealistically low ceiling





1 -- something like 14,000 -- when the cost was way over  
2 that. Until recently we were having to assume the balance  
3 of the capital cost, which is something now over \$20,000,000  
4 The actions recently of the Metropolitan Government in  
5 assuming future capital costs will assist Scarborough  
6 greatly.

7 Our Treasurer has prepared, and possibly you  
8 would like to see the comparative statistics for your  
9 detailed study; but for the purpose of this presentation  
10 we have detailed our five-year capital budget. The  
11 capital cost item of schools will reduce our debt as a  
12 percentage of our assessment by some two per cent. That  
13 is a fairly significant amount. We are still faced,  
14 however, with carrying this \$20,000,000.

15 It is our submission that if the principle  
16 is valid it should be applied. What has been done is a  
17 help, but if we are going to adopt the principle, let us  
18 adopt it, not part of it. We say Metropolitan Toronto  
19 should assume the existing capital costs of schools up to  
20 the formulas which you are also quite familiar with.

21 As I indicated, we are in a position that all  
22 -- I think I can say "all"; there may be one or two minor  
23 exceptions -- but all our capital costs have been below  
24 the recognized ceiling of capital costs. We are caught  
25 again on this unconditional grant matter -- I think you  
26 may be familiar with that -- where there is an unconditional  
27 grant paid by the province to the municipality and that  
28 increased with the size of the municipality, and I quote  
29 -- "In recognition of the large per capita expenditures  
30 that municipalities with a larger population are required





1 to make." And that is quite valid. A large municipality  
2 has a proportionately higher amount to pay for justice  
3 and all the other things that are included.

4 But in our case when we receive grants from  
5 Metro -- and part of the revenues of Metro are from the  
6 unconditional grants -- they are not paid out on a per  
7 capita basis where we need them in our area with a large  
8 population increase, large welfare costs and all the  
9 things that are envisaged in the Act. They are paid out  
10 on the assessment basis and we with the low assessment  
11 suffer.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: They are paid on that basis  
13 throughout the area; it is not only Scarborough.

14 MR. ONLEY: Yes, sir, but the area that has  
15 the low assessment is the one that suffers. If you have  
16 a high assessment you are doubly blessed.

17 In the last few days on hospital grants a  
18 step has been taken by Metro Council to assume a proportion  
19 of the hospital costs.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Excuse me, before you go  
21 to hospitals, you spoke of the benefit that Scarborough  
22 will derive from the change in the debt formula?

23 MR. ONLEY: Yes.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Will you say something  
25 about the benefit that Scarborough may derive from the  
26 increase in maintenance assistance grants?

27 MR. ONLEY: Yes.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: That too is since your  
29 brief was prepared.

30 MR. ONLEY: Yes, sir. The maintenance





1 assistance grants have been of great help -- are being  
2 of great help to us. The difficulty is that they are  
3 paid out on an equal per pupil basis by the statute,  
4 by the Metro Act, as you know. They are not related to  
5 the assessment, which is one of the key bases of educational  
6 cost payments by the Province.

7 In a low assessment area like Scarborough  
8 there is exactly the same dollars and cents per pupil  
9 paid as in the higher assessment area in Metro. There is  
10 no question that it helps us, but again it helps every  
11 body and helps those who do not have this need as great  
12 as we have.

13 As an aside, if I may at this juncture, when  
14 we deal with maintenance assistance payments we are back  
15 again to the situation I mentioned before where you can  
16 contain the education as a cost for one municipality.  
17 That is our big need.

18 But we wish to emphasize the fact that the  
19 farmer in the northeast part of Scarborough pays pro-  
20 portionately just about the same of his tax towards the  
21 cost of the subway and the Spadina Expressway and the  
22 Gardiner Expressway as the person who receives the direct  
23 benefit from it.

24 We are not arguing against these items going  
25 in, but we say what is fair for one is fair for the other  
26 and we endeavour without success to delineate a benefit  
27 to us from the Gardiner Expressway. But it is one of  
28 those things that it is awfully difficult to say Yes,  
29 it benefits the City of Toronto this much and it benefits  
30 East York this much.





1 We think it is a valid statement to say that  
2 it does certainly benefit the central core, as well it  
3 should. As you will note in the brief, we are not  
4 arguing against the central core. We say it must be  
5 strong. We make that specific statement.

6 But we do not want it to be thought that  
7 just because we get a bigger benefit in education that  
8 is fine, everything is happy, and somebody else is pulling  
9 us out. We say that is not the case. This is one area  
10 where we have a need. We have for ten years been  
11 contributing out of proportion to what we should have  
12 towards the needs of other area. We are not complaining  
13 about it, but let us not look at it in a distorted manner.

14 Turning to hospital grants, as I say, that has  
15 been dealt with in Metro Council and has been of some  
16 assistance. But hospitals are a Metro type of matter.  
17 A person has an accident on the 401 and in whichever  
18 municipality the accident happens to be determines to  
19 which hospital he might go -- or any street for that  
20 matter. It is our view that although the Metro grants  
21 will be of some assistance we are faced with a large  
22 addition to one hospital which will cost almost as much  
23 as a new hospital in its size, about 200 beds. Another  
24 hospital is being planned with another 200 beds. That  
25 still only gets us about a little over half way to what  
26 we need. But greater assistance is needed in this area  
27 and the capital costs of hospitals should be treated in  
28 the same manner as the capital costs of schools. This is  
29 a Metropolitan responsibility.

30 A minor problem -- and minor in the sense





1 of its day to day effect on the council, but a nagging  
2 problem -- is the question of licensing. We were against  
3 the formation of the Metro Licensing Commission because  
4 we considered that the comparatively small number of  
5 licences that would be of a Metro-wide nature did not  
6 warrant the establishment of a separate organization.

7           As we have dealt with in the brief, there  
8 have been many detailed nagging problems about some  
9 person wanting a licence for a restaurant out in the  
10 east end of Scarborough and he has to deal with the area  
11 office downtown, and there are inspections by our  
12 inspectors. There is reference to this, that and the  
13 other and of particular concern is the fact that the  
14 Municipal Act gives specific discretion to the council  
15 to refuse to grant a licence. The Provincial Government  
16 has seen fit to have that in the Act for as long as I  
17 remember. I know it goes back to way before the war.  
18 We consider this is the type of discretionary authority  
19 which councils should have in specific cases. It may  
20 be all very well to say that a piece of land is zoned  
21 so that (to take one case we had) a used car lot could  
22 go <sup>on</sup> it. But it may most inappropriate that there be  
23 a used car lot in that specific location. We consider  
24 that it is validly within the right of council. We not  
25 only consider it; the Municipal Act says it is validly  
26 within the right of council to grant or refuse. With a  
27 higher centralized administration this discretionary  
28 authority cannot be handled in a proper manner, and in  
29 fact it has been almost abandoned.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: As I understand it,  
2 licensing is completely centralized in the Licencing  
3 Commission as I right?

4 MR. ONLEY: Yes, with one or two exceptions  
5 such as dog licences.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Why do you say in your  
7 brief that the administrative problems of handling such  
8 a simple matter of a local licence becomes complicated  
9 and frustrating to applicants when so many bodies are  
10 handling the application? Does the applicant have to  
11 go to a number of organizations?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1 MR. ONLEY: Yes, as I indicated, sir.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Give an example.

3 MR. ONLEY: For instance, if he wants to  
4 start a restaurant he applies to the Area Office. That  
5 is sent downtown. It comes back and is checked over  
6 by our Fire Department to make sure it has proper fire  
7 access and exits and so on. It is checked by the  
8 building department to make sure it is structurally  
9 strong enough to hold up the large stoves or something  
10 like that. It is checked to make sure there are  
11 proper doors and so on. It is checked by the health  
12 department to make sure there are proper sewage  
13 facilities and so on.

14 That has to go back to the Area Office and  
15 then downtown. Then he eventually gets his licence.  
16 There is running back and forth. With the Metro  
17 inspectors there is bound to be some honest differences  
18 of opinion and the fire department may say something  
19 that may not be quite what the Metro licensing say  
20 was in effect somewhere else.

21 There are all these nagging delays and  
22 tie-ups that are unnecessary for a local licence. If  
23 it is in the area of an electrician or plumber, the  
24 ones that are clearly across Metro that is one thing.  
25 Where it is a local licence and only is involved with  
26 the local municipality, say the health department, that  
27 is a purely local matter. They could be better and  
28 more efficiently handled by the local municipality.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Even if licensing were  
30 to revert to the area of the municipality would you not





1 have to refer to the fire department and police depart-  
2 ment and health department, and so on? Instead of the  
3 local office of the Licensing Commission you would have  
4 the Area Licensing Authority. All it would save,  
5 from what you have said, is the trip downtown.

6 MR. ONLEY: It is not just the trip down-  
7 town. It is the running back and forth and the bits  
8 and pieces that are involved. It is not downtown, as  
9 a matter of fact. It is at Eglinton and Yonge. It  
10 is just all the paperwork back and forth that we con-  
11 sider unnecessary and it is a matter of purely local  
12 significance. It has no Metropolitan significance  
13 whatever.

14 MR. CAMPBELL: The Board makes the decision  
15 and collects the fees.

16 MR. ONLEY: We do the work.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: If the Board remitted  
18 the fees to you would you want to do the work?

19 MR. CAMPBELL: No. We don't feel that the  
20 Board is in the same position to make the decisions  
21 that we are in the local area. We know the situation.  
22 We don't feel they are as qualified to make the de-  
23 cision as we are.

24 MR. ONLEY: We consider Metro has been a  
25 success and the recommendations are made to improve  
26 what has been basically a good organization.

27 In conclusion, sir, we have kept our recom-  
28 mendations to three. We ask you to also consider the  
29 aspects we have considered that we have dealt with  
30 previously on the matter of planning and police. It





1 is consistent with our view that what is needed is a  
2 continuation of a strong local government and a federated  
3 two-tier system of government.

4 It is our view, whether one calls it a  
5 borough or a local city, that there be a borough system,  
6 which is what we have to a large measure now.

7 In our view, as a result of our studies,  
8 it would seem to us that approximately a 300,000 popu-  
9 lation should be established. You will note specifi-  
10 cally that we say there should be a minimum change in  
11 existing boundaries. The principle of local govern-  
12 ment can accommodate a flexibility of population. We  
13 don't come before you and say we are going to artifi-  
14 cially slice up the corner of St. Clair and Yonge. I  
15 think we can accommodate it within the existing  
16 boundaries with a minimum change of the existing  
17 boundaries.

18 We realize that there is some difference  
19 of opinion on this and that the establishment of the  
20 organization should give some consideration to the  
21 fact that there will be changes. There are bound to  
22 be. Our population is going to go up. There may be  
23 a consideration necessary in dealing with parts of  
24 the municipality that are now outside Metro.

25 Scarborough Council has had application  
26 from the west portion of Pickering to have us annex  
27 them. They applied to us. It is called West Rouge.  
28 That is given as an example. Along the north limit of  
29 North York it may well occur. Along Steeles Avenue  
30 there is intensive development. I have noticed this





1 at Bayview and Steeles and this continues along.

2 I recognize that is a difficult task to  
3 consider or place in this legislation. We know we  
4 are going to have a large increase in population. It  
5 is our view that we should recognize in any proposals  
6 for changes that it may be necessary for there to be  
7 some change in the future in the boroughs.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: When you say " a minimum  
9 change in existing boundaries" and you also suggest  
10 boroughs of approximately 300,000, that minimum will  
11 not be a minimum. You obviously are recommending  
12 that certain municipalities be annexed to other  
13 municipalities.

14 MR. ONLEY: Yes, sir. There are different  
15 views on which ones should annex to which others. We  
16 consider the important thing to establish is the  
17 principle of the local governmental unit and its  
18 approximate size. Upon that being established the  
19 rest can flow from that. I think it is fairly evi-  
20 dent that the three lakeshore municipalities may  
21 form a ward, as it were, of Etobicoke. There is  
22 some discussion which side of the Humber River Weston  
23 is on. We are not making any recommendation which  
24 side it be.

25 I think the principle established will  
26 mean the results that will flow from it can easily  
27 be calculated. There has to be special treatment  
28 for the City of Toronto just as there is in the centre  
29 of Metropolitan London.

30 Then as to the composition of the Metro





1 Council, as you know we recommend representation be on  
2 the basis of one representative per one hundred thousand,  
3 or a major portion thereof. At the present time that  
4 would give us a 20-member council and would accommodate  
5 the increase and delete the effect of one municipality  
6 going disproportionately higher in a short period of  
7 time. That would take care of a municipality that  
8 might increase rapidly by one hundred thousand popula-  
9 tion, which I understand North York may do in the next  
10 few years. I am pretty certain Scarborough might as  
11 well.

12 It would defer the necessity for recon-  
13 sidering boundaries if there is representation given  
14 on the Metro Council from the borough.

15 As to the composition of the borough  
16 council, we set out what our recommendations are. We  
17 recommend it be established by wards, a mayor reeve  
18 and executive committee and that the council itself  
19 would appoint its Metro representatives. One of  
20 course would be the reeve. As is the present  
21 arrangement the council would elect its chairman who  
22 would or would not be a member of Metro Council.

23 Secondly, there is financing. I don't  
24 propose to go into this any further unless you wish  
25 me to, sir. I would add we are concerned with the  
26 existing \$20 million outstanding as capital cost  
27 and further as to the maintenance assistance payments.  
28 It is our recommendation they be calculated on the  
29 ratio of number of people per thousand dollars in  
30 assessment, which is the real test of necessity.





1 As to general financing we have covered  
2 the matter of unconditional grants previously and we  
3 recommend they be disbursed on the same basis as  
4 received. Although they are unconditional grants  
5 they are in fact allocated to certain areas, such as  
6 Justice. It would be necessary for a formula to be  
7 established.

8 If the province in its wisdom feels that  
9 unconditional grants should be paid on a certain basis  
10 it is our considered view they should be paid out on  
11 that same basis.

12 As to licensing it is recommended that the  
13 matters of a local nature, which can be easily deter-  
14 mined, be handled by the local council. Where there  
15 are areas of Metro-wide significance why not adopt the  
16 means contained in the Municipal Act where a police  
17 commission handles the licences? We suggest it has  
18 worked well all over the Province of Ontario and if it  
19 is good enough for all the others we submit it should  
20 be good enough for Metro.

21 As a side effect of this, if the Police  
22 Commission were involved in this type of thing they  
23 would be more attuned to the public as such. They  
24 are part of the public. They are a subsidiary board  
25 and they carry heavy responsibilities.

26 I suggest that they can handle those and  
27 be of greater assistance to the municipalities. It is  
28 a comparatively small matter but it is still an impor-  
29 tant one. It is one area where possibly more people  
30 are directly involved across the table.





1                   If you have any other questions, sir, I  
2                   would be glad to answer them.    I think possibly the  
3                   Reeve has one matter to discuss.

4                   I am not sure whether you wish any further  
5                   statement on the matter of the Metro plan.    We have  
6                   studied that at some length and if you want us to go  
7                   into it any further we will.    I can file the state-  
8                   ment I referred to previously.   That is a very close  
9                   estimate, sir, of the change as a result of the  
10                  capital costs.

11                  Thank you very much, sir.

12                  THE COMMISSIONER:   Do you want to add  
13                  something now, Mr. Campbell, or would you like me to  
14                  put some questions to you?

15                  MR. CAMPBELL:    I think Mr. Onley has  
16                  covered everything.    If you put some questions I have  
17                  some thoughts along what you are particularly interested  
18                  in.    I would be directed by your questions.

19                  THE COMMISSIONER:   My Terms of Reference  
20                  interest me in everything.

21                  You suggested a borough system, each  
22                  borough to have a population of approximately three  
23                  hundred thousand.    You have made no specific recom-  
24                  mendation as to how the boroughs should be constituted.  
25                  Now I gather that under your borough system Scarborough  
26                  would remain as it is.

27                  MR. CAMPBELL:    It would at the present  
28                  time.    If we followed this policy that 300,000 people  
29                  would be a borough provision would probably be made  
30                  that some day Scarborough would become two boroughs.





1 We will be nearer a population of five or six hundred  
2 thousand in a few years.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Assuming a borough  
4 system of five or six boroughs were set up would it  
5 solve the particular problems of Scarborough arising  
6 from imbalance of assessment and so on.

7 MR. CAMPBELL: Not just the changing of the  
8 boroughs. Our recommendation is equalization of cost  
9 for equal services.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: It is conditions?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: You must have both. We  
12 are thinking of 300,000. We feel that would be a  
13 municipality that would be large enough to have all  
14 the departments working efficiently and yet small  
15 enough that we would keep the local interest.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: So what you are saying  
17 is that the setting up of the borough system will not  
18 solve Scarborough's problems unless the system is  
19 accompanied by the financial readjustment which you  
20 have recommended.

21 MR. CAMPBELL: That is quite correct;  
22 proper representation through the Council. We have  
23 three basic points as far as that is concerned. One  
24 is size of the borough; two, equalization of tariffs  
25 with equal services; three, is representation on  
26 Council.

27 If those three matters were cleared up I  
28 think we would have an improved Metro system and it  
29 would be quite workable and be a very satisfactory form  
30 of government.





1                   There are other minor changes.    Some  
2 changes, as you notice, have been taken care of under  
3 present legislation and can be taken care of, I think,  
4 if those recommendations are carried out.

5                   Certain formulas should be worked out  
6 for equalization of costs.    I think the legislation  
7 has to put some teeth in those formulas.    It cannot be  
8 optional.

9                   Municipal councils are always hesitant in  
10 voting something that is going to be detrimental  
11 financially to their own municipalities.    I must say  
12 there has been a good deal of assistance throughout  
13 by the Metro School Board recently making assistance  
14 grants.    It was not done unanimously but was done by  
15 majority.    That is a point that is difficult unless  
16 it is written in the legislation.    This problem of  
17 maintenance assistance grants would not have developed  
18 if the legislation had stated sixty per cent of the  
19 costs of education would be borne by equalizing  
20 maintenance assistance grants.    Then there would not  
21 be any question for the Metropolitan School Board.

22                   THE COMMISSIONER:    Would amalgamation  
23 provide the equalization that you want?

24                   MR. CAMPBELL:    I suppose amalgamation  
25 would provide the equalization of costs.    Then everybody  
26 would get the same tax bill.    I am afraid those people  
27 who are talking about amalgamation today would find  
28 they are paying a bigger share and thereby their taxes  
29 would be higher than they are under the borough system  
30 or under a Metro system.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that the main reason  
2 for your opposition to amalgamation?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: No, my opposition to  
4 amalgamation is because I believe that any adminis-  
5 trative unit can be too large, too unwieldy. I be-  
6 lieve that the councillor member who is passing laws  
7 and regulations should be very familiar with the people  
8 he is dealing with. When you look at that map of  
9 Metropolitan Toronto there from Pickering to beyond  
10 27 Highway, it is in the neighbourhood of 25 miles.  
11 I know the Township of Scarborough very well but I  
12 do not know Etobicoke and I do not know the west side  
13 of North York or even the west side of Toronto in  
14 the detail I should know it if I am going to make  
15 decisions on it. If someone wants to get a building  
16 permit on Royal York Road in Etobicoke, I do not know  
17 the conditions and therefore I am not in a position  
18 as a Council member to make a decision. If somebody  
19 wants a building permit or a zoning bylaw, or some-  
20 thing that the Council has to act on in the Township  
21 of Scarborough, I know the property in detail.

22  
23 -

24  
25  
26 -

27  
28  
29  
30 -





Therefore I am in a much better position to make the decision, and I would say that the size of the municipality must be within the scope of one man's or of any man's ability to know the municipality well; 25 miles across, or the size of the metropolitan area for the details that affect people's property; that a man must know the property well.

That is not as important when it is a major decision about building a sewage disposal plant down along the Lakefront or building a great trunk sewer up through an area; that is not affecting so many, and any details the local person would know. It may affect somebody's property, and that is why the Metro system works because the major projects are in the hands of the Metro Council. We don't need the detail of knowledge of the local property to solve this. However, for local matters we should have the detail knowledge of personal property, so I say the Metropolitan area is too large for a council to administer properly.

THE COMMISSIONER: You think that the advantages of maintaining local autonomy for matters of local concern would be greater than the equalization that might come from amalgamation?

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that we can get sufficient equalization of costs through the Metro system and still retain the value of local administration.

THE COMMISSIONER: Would you get the necessary equalization without transferring additional functions to the Metro corporation?

MR. CAMPBELL: I would agree there would





1 have to be more controls within the Metropolitan Council,  
2 otherwise if not, if one local municipality finds that  
3 they are not going to have to pay for something altogether  
4 they might spend a little more freely on the Metropolitan  
5 Council, and control that, and the Metropolitan School  
6 Board.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: How do you define  
8 "control"?

9 MR. CAMPBELL: Sitting on the boundaries  
10 within which a local municipality can go in their spend-  
11 ing without permission of the Metro Council.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Are you suggesting then,  
13 that Metro should set certain maximum standards for  
14 expenditures?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: I would expect that would be  
16 it. We have not -- so far as that is concerned, take  
17 the Metropolitan sewer system. We have drawn a line,  
18 and there has been no problem with it. The Metropolitan  
19 government looks after the sewers, disposal plant and  
20 the trunk sewer up to a point on that sewer which would  
21 drain one thousand acres beyond. We go up that far. That  
22 will be a Metropolitan responsibility, so that these  
23 boundaries get set, and we have done it in the schools  
24 now that we will be paid the costs of schools up to a  
25 ceiling price. If a local area municipality wants to  
26 go and build better schools than that, they pay for it  
27 out of their own current funds. We have set boundaries  
28 like that.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: But you would not re-  
30 strain the local municipality from going beyond the





1 standards set by Metro if they are prepared to levy  
2 their own citizens, would you?

3 MR. CAMPBELL: No. That is the system  
4 that local municipality can have, and that is where you  
5 can get some individual characteristics developing in  
6 your local municipality rather than having a uniform  
7 law right across the whole Metropolitan area.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: There was some criticism  
9 of the operation of the police force under the present  
10 system. What specific changes do you really recommend?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: Well, one of the problems I  
12 would say is the continual changing of police from one  
13 area to another. Therefore, our policemen are strangers  
14 in the district in which they are working. They don't  
15 become familiar with the local problems, the local  
16 interests. They are just a man in blue standing on the  
17 corner or driving a cruiser. They are not considered as  
18 a citizen of the community because they are strangers.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: Is this moving of police  
20 from one area to another a deliberate policy?

21 MR. CAMPBELL: I believe so.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Would there not be some  
23 advantages to that?

24 MR. CAMPBELL: Undoubtedly the Commission  
25 think there is, but we think there is quite a loss in  
26 the public appreciation of the policeman because they  
27 don't know them. The other factor is the one mentioned,  
28 in certain parts of police work it is directed out of  
29 the local police station. We have the Scarborough divi-  
30 sion. Certain of that work is directed from there. Other  
of the divisions are directed from downtown and the central





1 police downtown. If a man is directed to be a traffic  
2 officer, and then if he goes along the road and sees a  
3 by-law being broken by somebody else on property, he  
4 can shrug his shoulders and say "Oh, I am a traffic  
5 officer. I am not a general enforcement officer of the  
6 laws of the municipality."

7 They are getting put in categories, and they  
8 feel they are responsible for the division that they are  
9 attached to. They get specialized in their own particular  
10 division within the police force, and I think this is  
11 necessary probably in the organization and management  
12 of a huge police force. We would like to see the local  
13 district chief have more control, more direction of the  
14 local matters in his municipality.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: But you are not recommend-  
16 ing a return to the days before the creation of the  
17 Metropolitan force.

18 MR. CAMPBELL: No, but more local control.  
19 We as a municipality have by-laws to enforce. Our own  
20 Township by-laws. Well, it is difficult to get the  
21 police. They will say they don't know about this by-  
22 law. They just don't seem to take the same interest in  
23 enforcing the local by-laws that they should because they  
24 have no direct liaison with us.

25 We never see the Police Commission. I, as  
26 Reeve of Scarborough, only see the Police Commission when  
27 they come to us or Metro Council for their budget and  
28 appointing members to the Commission. That is the only  
29 time we see the Commission. I think I have been up once  
30 on a specific problem that I had to go to the Commission





1 myself. Otherwise the elected body don't have any  
2 association with the Commission.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, the fact that you  
4 only had to go up once, does that not indicate you really  
5 have not much to complain about?

6 MR. CAMPBELL: Well, this happened to be a  
7 different problem, but we have many of the day-to-day  
8 problems that we would like to bring to the attention of  
9 the police. We asked the police chief, district chief,  
10 to come and see us at one time, and we contacted downtown,  
11 and they sent over another officer, but the district  
12 chief did not think he should come.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Coming to planning,  
14 Reeve Campbell, would you favour a uniform zoning by law  
15 for the metropolitan area?

16 MR. CAMPBELL: Absolutely not. I can't see  
17 -- I can't look forward to seeing a city of the size of  
18 this with everything uniform right from side to side and  
19 south to north. I think we want a city with a little bit  
20 of difference; that it doesn't all look as though it came  
21 out of the same stamping mill.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: I asked that question  
23 because that was recommended by one of the suburbs.

24 MR. CAMPBELL: No. I maintain that the  
25 Metropolitan Planning Board is spending too much time on  
26 details when they should be sitting down a major overall  
27 plan of this Metropolitan area, deciding where major  
28 arteries of traffic should go, deciding where major  
29 industrial and residential areas, in cooperation with  
30 the area municipalities, and overall timing and phasing





1 of the work.

2 Metro spends money for capital works for  
3 sewers; they should have a timing program, a phasing  
4 program for the development and spending of this money  
5 five years ahead, and where it is going to go. They  
6 should lay down the ground rules there and then leave  
7 it up to the local planning board to decide whether this  
8 is going to be a commercial development here or an  
9 apartment here -- the local zoning.

10 How in the world can the Metropolitan Blanning  
11 Board with people sitting on the planning board from down  
12 in Pickering and up in Markham Township and Vaughan  
13 Township and out in Toronto Township and, yes, the rest  
14 of the Metropolitan area, decide whether on a certain  
15 corner, a street corner in the Township of Scarborough,  
16 should be an apartment house or whether it should be a  
17 theatre? How do they know the local problem to say  
18 whether it should be an apartment house or theatre --  
19 on the planning board from all these municipalities --  
20 anymore than I have the right to say what should be out  
21 on a local corner out in Toronto Township. They are there.  
22 They are the people that are making the decision when they  
23 are deciding on a zoning.

24 The only thing they can do and the only thing  
25 I can do -- I did sit on the Metropolitan Blanning Board,  
26 and when there was an application for an amendment in a  
27 by-law in Toronto Township, the only thing I could say  
28 as a member of the Metropolitan planning Board, is look  
29 around at the director and say "What do you recommend?".  
30 How am I to tell? It is too large. Too big. Leave





1 local zoning to the local municipality.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: You favour a uniform  
3 building by-law for the area?

4 MR. CAMPBELL: I think it would be a benefit,  
5 and I think we are working towards that. Our building  
6 inspectors have been working towards it for a number of  
7 years. We had a by-law, the other day just in connection  
8 with buildings, a by-law which our fire department wanted  
9 to put to us, what type of building must have sprinkler  
10 systems and steel stairways and so on in public buildings.  
11 We dealt with that by-law, and before we passed it, we  
12 sent it to North York and Etobicoke and asked for their  
13 comments and asked whether they would like to join with  
14 us and have a meeting that we might all pass a by-law that  
15 would be the same. I think there is merit in that.

16 We had a meeting with our public utilities  
17 commission. Etobicoke, North York and Toronto Township  
18 public utilities have to have uniform standards for  
19 underground wiring. I think we are working these things  
20 out, and with a little encouragement on it, we would work  
21 them out so that they would be uniform throughout. A great  
22 deal of merit in it.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: These are all the questions  
24 I have to ask. If you want to add anything or any member  
25 of your council, Reeve Campbell, you may go ahead.

26 MR. CAMPBELL: I think I have covered most  
27 of the points I have made notes on here. I don't know  
28 if any members of the council wish to say anything.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you give your name,  
30 please?





1 MR. MALLETTE: Mallette.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: I am going to hear from  
3 you.

4 MR. MALLETTE: I have had correspondence  
5 with you before, sir, during your Commission as to:  
6 safety problems in Ontario here.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: You are presenting a  
8 brief to me are you not?

9 MR. MALLETTE: Yes, sir.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not presenting it  
11 now?

12 MR. MALLETTE: No.

13 MR. CAMPBELL: He is wearing two hats.

14 MR. MALLETTE: My Reeve suggested I am  
15 wearing two hats, Mr. Goldenberg, and of course as a  
16 lawyer I am sure you will recognize that is a possibility.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I take it you do not wear  
18 them at the same time.

19 MR. MALLETTE: As a matter of fact, Mr.  
20 Goldenberg, I don't wear hats at all. I have some  
21 differences of opinion and I think that I would like to  
22 point them out. If you would bear with me I think there  
23 is some information here I can relate to the questions  
24 that you asked of our previous speakers.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Provided, as I said, you  
26 are not submitting your own brief now because I have set  
27 a date for that.

28 MR. MALLETTE: Yes, of course, sir. I just  
29 want to point out first of all, Mr. Goldenberg, that we  
30 are arguing all the way around the problem and not putting





1 our finger on it. The Council Act indicates a councillor  
2 in the township is a part-time proposition; their  
3 remuneration is based on that, and as a result of that,  
4 very briefly it means that people like the eminent lawyer  
5 that made a presentation to you yesterday indicated he  
6 regretted not being on council, has the same opportunity  
7 as I or anyone else of gaining a seat on council, but  
8 they choose not to do so.

9 I am suggesting, sir, that the calibre of  
10 politicians in the Metro area is such that the present  
11 system does not work. Towards that end I would first  
12 of all refer you to the brief that I believe is part of  
13 our Township's submission that we presented to  
14 Mr. Robarts.

15 I want to point out in answer to two of your  
16 previous questions, Mr. Goldenberg, that the Ontario  
17 Municipal Board cut off or rather delayed our debentures  
18 in the spring of 1962; as a result of that, we had a  
19 meeting with him, and as a result of that, there were  
20 some other matters that accrued from that meeting, the  
21 major two of which is a direction from the Ontario Municipal  
22 Board to the Metropolitan Council. It was dated March 28,  
23 1963. I am not sure you have a copy, sir. I won't read it.  
24 It is rather lengthy.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Is that the one that refers  
26 to the Scarborough debt?

27 MR. MALLETT: Yes.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: I have read it.

29 MR. MALLETT: We objected to expenditures  
30 of the Spadina Expressway. We objected to the curtailment





1 of our debentures to supply educational costs, and the  
2 result was the Ontario Municipal Board Chairman ordered  
3 Metro to assume a portion of the T. T. C. debt and ordered  
4 Metro to assume capital costs of schools. It was not a  
5 decision of the Metro Council. The other matter I want  
6 to point out to you, Mr. Commissioner, you asked, sir,  
7 of our previous speaker, our deputy solicitor, regarding  
8 the results of the assumption of capital costs of schools  
9 and also on the maintenance assistance payments. Now,  
10 I want to mention to you, sir, we are on a very fine  
11 thread. Through the reasoning and good conscience of  
12 trustees, Davison, Coutts, Lowes and Lang; of the City of  
13 Toronto we avoided a four-mill increase in our municipality  
14 this year. They voted for the increased maintenance  
15 assistance grants along with the suburban representatives  
16 to the Metro School Board, and that affected our mill rate  
17 to the extent of close to four or a little better than  
18 four mills. So that if it were not for the good conscience  
19 of those four trustees we would have had a much higher  
20 increase, and maintenance assistance grants is a factor  
21 that must be very seriously considered by yourself so  
22 that it is not left up to the conscience of persons elected  
23 in other areas.

24 It was suggested, Mr. Goldenberg, that certain  
25 people of the Metro area bear more than their share toward  
26 Metro costs. In an elaboration of the statements that were  
27 made to you earlier sir, I would point out in Scarborough  
28 we have some 32,000 tax billings to homes under N. H. A.  
29 financing. The majority of these homes are in subdivisions.  
30





1 It was pointed out to you, sir, there  
2 is a five dollar a foot frontage charge amounting to some  
3 \$4,000,000 cash towards the trunk sewers. In addition  
4 to that, included in the price of the house, there was  
5 a five per cent of the lot value donated to the municipality  
6 for parks. I would point out to you, sir, these persons  
7 are paying the highest mill rate in Metro. They are  
8 paying the same Metro mill rate as any other person in  
9 the Metro area. In addition to that because of the  
10 particular problems in Scarborough, they are paying the  
11 highest or the second highest by a fraction of a mill, and  
12 have done so for ten years or that portion of that time  
13 that they have been residents; the highest tax rate in  
14 Metro.

15 If anyone is carrying an undue portion of the  
16 cost of Metro, it is certainly those persons who are in  
17 subdivisions in new homes.

18 I suggest, sir, that your questions on the  
19 Metro planning, if it were possible, sir, for you to  
20 review some of the minutes of the Metro planning, from  
21 sample minutes of the Metro Planning Board meetings  
22 during the reign of the previous metro chairman, Mr.  
23 Gardiner, you will find that in many instances there was  
24 a bare quorum. Many of the members of that Metro  
25 Planning Board are also Reeves of municipalities with  
26 several full time jobs which of course, relates back to  
27 the Municipal Act, because it does not make provision  
28 for the security or remuneration to attract a person who  
29 would be able to devote his full time to that job of  
30 Reeve or Councilor. With a bare quorum you will find





1 in most cases -- at least this is what I found, sir,  
2 that motions were made by the Metro Chairman and seconded  
3 by other persons.  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 -  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 -  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 -  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 -  
24  
25  
26  
27 -  
28  
29  
30





1 I would submit to you, sir, that the  
2 Planning Director, the Metro Chairman and the Treasurer  
3 ran Metro.

4 You asked some questions regarding police  
5 and you asked particularly, sir, of our Reeve if we felt  
6 that there was an advantage to the rotation. I certainly  
7 feel that there is. I was chairman of our Traffic  
8 Committee for a number of years and we have had very  
9 close relationships. In the five years I have been on  
10 Council, sir, we have dealt with four different traffic  
11 inspectors. It is not so much the rotation but the  
12 frequency of the rotation.

13 I would like to back up the Reeve in his  
14 statement that the police are unfamiliar with the laws  
15 that they are supposed to be charged with enforcing.  
16 The fact of the matter is that the Commission is so  
17 remote and has been staffed by the Metro Chairman, who  
18 was far too busy to put in sufficient time, and by the  
19 Mayor of the City of Toronto, who is far too busy to  
20 put in sufficient time, plus a former suburban elected  
21 representative with no previous police experience. So in  
22 my opinion the Police Commission is inadequately set up  
23 and in fact unnecessarily. It is a responsibility of  
24 the Metro Council.

25 I would point out to you, sir, in regard to  
26 the police that their Police Association estimates by  
27 taking the amount of overtime that they are required to  
28 work and dividing that out with the staff, they feel  
29 there are 1,000 men under the proper number of persons  
30 that should be policing the Metro area. A firm of





1 experts from the United States was hired some years ago  
2 and at that time they indicated they were 500 men under-  
3 staffed.

4 I suggest, sir, that it is as a result of  
5 that fact - that Metro has ignored ignored proper policing  
6 - that there is a gradual breakdown of society in this  
7 Metro area. I can cite many instances of that, sir.

8 This ties into the licensing, because there  
9 are many occasions, sir, when operators of licensed  
10 establishments encourage the hanging around of loiterers.  
11 In fact we had one just discussed on Monday. The result  
12 is assaults and abuse. And you get situations where  
13 people cannot walk along a public street because licensed  
14 premises are using the boulevard and the sidewalk and  
15 are accosting people on the street to sell used cars.  
16 In fact I had it happen to me when a salesman walked out  
17 on the street and poked his head through my window to  
18 try and sell me a car because I happened to stop in front  
19 of a used car dealer.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: Did he sell you one?

21 MR. MALLETT: No, he did not, sir. I am  
22 suggesting to you that because of the lack of police  
23 there are times when the threat of the non-renewal of  
24 the licence would go a long way towards correcting these  
25 situations when you do not have enough police to act as  
26 preventative policing on patrol.

27 I have no complaint towards the police in  
28 their actions once something has occurred. My complaint  
29 with the police is that there are not sufficient of them  
30 to patrol to prevent crime.





1                   There are other arguments, Mr. Goldenberg,  
2   that I will be presenting with my brief, but I want to  
3   point out some of what are in my opinion incompatible  
4   statements in this brief.   First of all ---

5                   THE COMMISSIONER:   You are not going to do  
6   that when you present your brief, are you?

7                   MR. MALLETTE:   No.   I am suggesting to you,  
8   sir, that there are some incompatible statements in our  
9   Township brief.

10                  THE COMMISSIONER:   Yes, but do you want to  
11   cover that now?

12                  MR. MALLETTE:   Briefly, sir.

13                  THE COMMISSIONER:   Are you going to cover  
14   it in your brief?

15                  MR. MALLETTE:   No, sir.   My brief contains  
16   my own ideas.   These are collective ideas.

17                  THE COMMISSIONER:   I just want you to know,  
18   Mr. Mallette, that I have given you a date for yourself  
19   and if when you present----

20                  MR. MALLETTE:   I am not presenting it, sir.

21                  THE COMMISSIONER:   I have a full record of  
22   what you are saying and if when you present your brief  
23   you try to cover the same subjects I shall rule you out  
24   of order because I am not going to have two briefs  
25   presented by one person.   If I extend that privilege  
26   to you I will have to extend it to everyone.

27                  MR. MALLETTE:   You are the Commissioner, sir,  
28   and you are the one to decide these things.   I am sug-  
29   gesting to you today there are some incompatible state-  
30   ments here.   As you know, I am in favour of amalgamation.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I do not know this yet  
2 officially.

3 MR. MALLETT: I am sorry. Then I presume  
4 you have not read my brief. I am and have been since  
5 1959.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: I said I do not know  
7 officially. That is why I am waiting for your brief.

8 MR. MALLETT: Right. I submitted copies  
9 to you, sir. I presumed you had read it, sir. I am in  
10 favour of amalgamation and I point out in our brief that  
11 we say it is most important that the core of the City be  
12 developed. I am stating to you, sir, that if you say  
13 that then you cannot compatibly say that you are in  
14 favour of a borough system because if the strength, the  
15 cultural commercial strength in the centre of the City  
16 and the suburbs contribute to that, then they in turn  
17 must share with us.

18 It is the resident ratepayer that we must  
19 show our concern for. Businesses can write off their  
20 taxes into their product and take it off their income  
21 tax. It hits the resident ratepayer and we cannot  
22 divide into boroughs and retain the financial strength  
23 that is necessary to carry us.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. We will  
25 adjourn for ten minutes.

26 ---SHORT RECESS.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Reeve Campbell?

28 MR. CAMPBELL: Councillor Gerrow had a  
29 very brief comment to make before we broke off. I would  
30 request that you give him permission to speak.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

2 MR. GERROW: Thank you, Mr. Goldenberg.

3 My comment is more a matter of drawing your attention to  
4 a statement which I thought would be under a separate  
5 cover. It is regarding the matter of equalization of  
6 costs, particularly in education. Of course, a uniform  
7 tax rate over the various municipalities would accomplish  
8 this, but along with this is the situation where someone  
9 must decide whether Scarborough is going to be brought up  
10 to the standard of Toronto under this or whether Toronto  
11 is to be brought down. In other words there is a  
12 tremendous amount of, shall we say, negotiation - or else  
13 some staff must decide what changes would take place.

14 When this particular consideration was first  
15 thought of it was because of a statement made in the  
16 report of the Metropolitan School Board that it is  
17 mathematically impossible to establish a new method of  
18 determining assistance payments which will circumvent  
19 the unequal ability to finance education in the eleven  
20 school districts.

21 I believe in this formula you do have that,  
22 plus a built-in restraint from overspending on the part  
23 of any municipality, and I do not have to tell you the  
24 situation when each is paying the same and each trying  
25 to get as much as possible. There is a problem there.  
26 This formula does overcome that, and it is in your pos-  
27 session. I believe you do have this. Do you have this,  
28 sir?

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Do I have that, Mr.

30 Finnis?





1 MR. GERROW: Council understood that you  
2 were getting it.

3 THE SECRETARY: If it was not submitted  
4 with the brief we have not received it.

5 MR. GERROW: Well, I am sorry about that.

6 MR. CAMPBELL: It is with the brief and you  
7 have it.

8 MR. GERROW: If I might point this out and  
9 ask that either you or your staff give this consideration,  
10 I would be very pleased at any time if they would call  
11 me and I will come and explain it, because I think it  
12 does all these things. I know that time is of the  
13 essence here and if I can have some assurance that it  
14 will have consideration, that is all I wish, Mr.  
15 Goldenberg.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Certainly. Is that an  
17 extra copy by any chance?

18 MR. GERROW: It is my last one, I think.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I would like to keep  
20 this because I do not remember receiving it. Thank you,  
21 yes; I see it.

22 MR. GERROW: Thank you very much, sir.

23 MR. CAMPBELL: If there is any doubt about  
24 those there were two supplements with the brief. One was  
25 this formula for the maintenance assistance grants and  
26 the other was.....

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Licensing.

28 MR. CAMPBELL: Those agencies are licensing  
29 agencies that we think should be local, and this we  
30 think should be Metro. Those are the two supplements.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I have the one. I did  
2 not have the other.

3 A COUNCILLOR: It had to do with the brief  
4 to Premier Robarts. It was appended to that.

5

6

7

8 -

9

10

11

12

13

14 -

15

16

17

18

19 -

20

21

22

23

24 -

25

26

27

28

29 -

30





SUBMISSION OF THE TOWN OF NEW TORONTO

Appearances:

Mr. J. T. Weir, Q.C.

Mr. Gordon Baycroft

Mr. Joseph Miller

Mr. Garnet James

Mr. Stanley Zuk

-----

MR. WEIR: My name is Jack Weir. I am appearing for New Toronto. With me is Councillor Gordon Baycroft. The Mayor is unfortunately not available. I wonder if Mr. Baycroft would come up? Also present is Mr. Joseph Miller, Mr. Garnet James, the Treasurer, and another Councillor, Mr. Stanley Zuk.

Mayor Russell regrets he cannot be here, but he is out of the city at the moment. Mr. Baycroft is the senior member of Council.

THE COMMISSIONER: I have read this brief. It is not necessary for<sup>you</sup> to re-read it. You may read excerpts from it.

MR. WEIR: What I planned to do, if I may, is to try and emphasize two or three major submissions that I would say New Toronto has to make. Then I hope you might indicate the areas either from the brief or areas outside the brief with which you have particular concern from having seen a better cross-section of the total picture than we have. We have seen some of the briefs of other municipalities - not all of them - and I could not say we have studied them with great care.

You said in the press on one occasion that





1 you expected to hear a lot about local autonomy and I  
2 am afraid this is the occasion when you are going to  
3 hear something of it.

4 I think it is important in your ultimate  
5 consideration that you recognize the kind of municipality  
6 that New Toronto is. I can say to you, I think, that  
7 it is reasonably unique in the Metropolitan area. It is  
8 unique not only historically but it is unique in its  
9 actual administration today.

10 Let me take you back, if I may - and for  
11 your notes I can say to you I am dealing just with my  
12 Roman numeral heading I. New Toronto came into being  
13 in 1913. Etobicoke, as you will appreciate, was then  
14 a really rural municipality. There were a few hamlets  
15 and that was the situation with regards to Etobicoke.  
16 Really right down until some time after the last war  
17 Etobicoke still remained basically rural. When you  
18 drive through it today it is hard to believe that so  
19 much of its growth and expansion has taken place in fact  
20 since the war.

21 The New Toronto back in 1913 came into  
22 being as a very definite little urban section with just  
23 under a thousand people. Since 1913 it has been grow-  
24 ing until today one could say that apart from some land  
25 that may become available by relocation of the railway  
26 it is literally a filled up municipality. There are  
27 some areas for extension of existing industries but even  
28 they are pretty well crowded on their land.

29 New Toronto, as you know and as I am sure  
30 it has been said in all sorts of other briefs, is painted





1 as a rich community, a community that has somehow  
2 achieved a better position in life than its neighbours  
3 in the municipal sense. This has been a deliberate act  
4 of New Toronto. It is not Topsy growing up.

5 New Toronto from its urbanization in 1913  
6 right down to this afternoon has recognized that its  
7 people wanted something different. They were prepared  
8 to have industry cheek by jowl with residential. They  
9 were not seeking all the amenities that one finds in  
10 Forest Hill or many of the other communities in the  
11 Metropolitan area. They were prepared, with the  
12 advantage that they saw in having an industrial community,  
13 to locate their homes, as I say cheek by jowl.

14 New Toronto over the years up until roughly  
15 two or three years ago when the four statutes were  
16 changed granted industrial assessments on a fixed basis  
17 as permitted by the Act and on each one of these took  
18 an affirmative vote of the ratepayers. It is not  
19 enough for Council <sup>to</sup>/initiate it. In Ontario you have  
20 to have an affirmative <sup>vote</sup>/of the actual ratepayers. And  
21 these ratepayers voted themselves the kind of municipality  
22 they wanted and it grew up. And the Council have rec-  
23 ognized this so I can say to you that I think any  
24 investigation you care to make will establish this -  
25 that New Toronto has an industrial climate which industry  
26 recognizes and that it has had, shall we say, more say  
27 in its influence on the municipality (and probably the  
28 one voter or two) that normally comes from the assessment  
29 of the district.

30 New Toronto has attempted to provide the





1 climate and consequently it has a remarkable industrial  
2 development for the number of acres and it has some  
3 fairly substantial benefits from this admittedly. It  
4 also has the great disadvantages that go with this.

5 Many of the early communities that granted  
6 fixed assessment disappeared; but in New Toronto if you  
7 look at it right now, you will see that the New Toronto  
8 industries have all expanded in New Toronto. They have  
9 not gone off in other directions. This is due to the  
10 fact that New Toronto has this climate and continued it.

11 When you get a municipality of only 12,800  
12 people and a small acreage - you have statistical  
13 figures on the size; we are a relatively small munici-  
14 pality----

15 THE COMMISSIONER: I have travelled  
16 through it. I have seen it and I know it.

17 MR. WEIR: Yes, and I think we supplied you  
18 with certain figures about the members of our staff.  
19 You will see it is in every sense a small municipality.  
20 It has all the advantages of that small municipality.

21 This is the one community - no doubt you  
22 are going to hear this from a lot of other people, but  
23 this is the one community where because of the physical  
24 compression of it, because of the closeness and the  
25 small staff you are not having to deal with the twenty-  
26 third assistant man in charge of licensing or something  
27 of this kind. You get to the man who makes the decision  
28 in New Toronto by just wandering in off the street to  
29 the office. You get the same kind of relationship.  
30 The Councillor is your neighbour in New Toronto. He





1 could not be anything else. There is not room for him  
2 to be any distance away from you. He is your neighbour  
3 of necessity. He is probably in many cases a local  
4 merchant, probably the<sup>only</sup> one of that trade in the community;  
5 so he is the fellow from whom you buy your hats or shoes  
6 or something of this kind.

7 This has this unique kind of little  
8 character and I say to you with the greatest respect to  
9 all the great ideas that have been put out before you  
10 that New Toronto would of course like to continue that  
11 very unique nature. When a municipality has a history  
12 of this kind and has worked at doing something and ac-  
13 complishing something, of course, because it has some  
14 little financial success from it, it hates to see itself  
15 expropriated into some bigger world where it is going to  
16 be such small part that its influence and character is  
17 bound to undergo tremendous change. Any sort of a  
18 borough concept obviously eliminates New Toronto because  
19 12,000 people in any sized borough that has been mentioned  
20 to you is such a small number that it cannot mean very  
21 much.

22 The second thing I want to emphasize in  
23 your thinking is that I think it is hard to grasp - and I  
24 am sure you will grasp it better than anyone else in the  
25 Metropolitan area - but I can say to you from my own  
26 personal experience in appearing before councils in the  
27 Metropolitan area that they all over-emphasize their own  
28 importance as councils. When you look at the budget -  
29 and I suggest you take the budget of any one of the  
30 municipalities in Metro (do not take ours; take any of the





1 others) - and you just examine how much of that budget  
2 is really in the control of the local councillor. It  
3 is a very small percentage of that total budget. In  
4 New Toronto I can tell you it is just under one-fifth of  
5 the budget that the Council could be said to have any  
6 control over. The remainder of the budget is competely  
7 out of their hands because of the school board, because  
8 of Metro and because of all the other factors. This by  
9 the way is not a school board for the municipality but  
10 a school board for the three municipalities in the  
11 district.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1 In the light of that New Toronto feels  
2 it is making its contribution to the Metro picture and  
3 will make more contribution if you, in your wisdom,  
4 feel there should be a lesser area of local autonomy.

5 We do feel that we would like to preserve  
6 some community, some existence as a town. Maybe we  
7 will have to go from a fifth to a sixth control of our  
8 own affairs.

9 We recognize there may be areas where it is  
10 still desirable. There has been some discussion about  
11 schools. We would not take any strong opposition  
12 about making our contribution to the whole Metropolitan  
13 area but we would like to control the paving of our own  
14 streets; a few little things that would keep us as a  
15 community with this community relationship.

16 Now I can tell you that the opposition to  
17 amalgamation in ninety per cent of the cases, and I say  
18 this to you very frankly, is because no one likes to go  
19 out of existence. The staff of the municipalities are  
20 keen. They would rather be a senior man in Scar-  
21 borough than a third level or fourth level man in a  
22 new amalgamation. The Council would rather be a  
23 council in Scarborough than one of a bigger group in  
24 some amalgamated area.

25 This is a natural reaction of people. I am  
26 sure you find that wherever you go. No matter how big  
27 or how little a thing is everybody would like to keep  
28 his own little ship rather than losing it to become a  
29 hand in a very much bigger ship.

30 I can say to you that New Toronto is one





1 community which means something to the people, as dis-  
2 tinct from the elected representative. Perhaps it is  
3 because of size, perhaps the lack of history, maybe  
4 because they got in on the programme of industrial  
5 assessment, but they have a stake in these things and  
6 they recognize, I am sure, that they must make the  
7 fullest contribution in fairness and in charity and  
8 in every other way to the Metro area. They would  
9 like to preserve some little locality of their own.  
10 They would like to preserve some little sense of being  
11 a community and not being lost in the city.

12 That really is the burden of our brief.

13 Now how can this be accomplished? I have been told,  
14 and I am sure it has been said many times, this is an  
15 unattainable ideal of this age. You just must turn  
16 all municipal government into a sort of board of  
17 directors presiding over a mass of civil servants.  
18 It is much like a small provincial government or  
19 something of this kind. It is said that this is  
20 the only solution for cities of this size.

21 We are not satisfied that is true. The  
22 reason we are not satisfied it is true is taken up in  
23 the brief and begins on page 3.

24 I admit this whole section is just a  
25 compilation of speeches and statements made at the time  
26 of the creation of Metro and immediately following.  
27 The reason we have done this is we thought we could  
28 bring out for you and bring your attention to these  
29 things. I am sure all this matter is before you. It  
30 is so massive that one could not work their way through





1 it. We have tried to select something to give you a  
2 picture of how this Metro came into being and what the  
3 pros and cons were at the time.

4 Now it boils down to this, that in our  
5 submission Metro has been a tremendous success. That  
6 is despite the fact you have been appointed a Royal  
7 Commissioner to look at it and despite the fact that  
8 the City of Toronto has come forward with ideas of  
9 amalgamation; despite Mr. Gathercole and the rest.

10 We think that you can look at any government  
11 THE COMMISSIONER: Even outside the  
12 municipal field?

13 MR. WEIR: Even outside the municipal  
14 field. I think you are taking an interest in taxation  
15 and you must have found wonderful anomalies there.

16 Now we think if you grasp the problem that  
17 Metro was created to solve you will see how well it has  
18 solved it. We think you will come to share our  
19 opinion that Metro has been a great success.

20 This does not mean anything that is success-  
21 ful cannot be improved and changed, whether it is re-  
22 allocation of school costs or changing the police.

23 I look upon these things as not fundamental.  
24 They are changes that every institution must undergo.  
25 It is important, I think, that you grasp what the pro-  
26 blem was and how much has been done to solve it.

27 I don't think we can tell you exactly why  
28 it was a great success. We have tried at one or two  
29 hearings to go this. I think we must recognize that  
30 some things are great successes because their need is





1 so great.

2 I don't know whether I am saying this very  
3 well. We might have created Metro five years earlier  
4 and it would have been a terrific flop. When the  
5 need is very great and you create an institution and  
6 that institution is four-fifths good it will still do  
7 a tremendous job. Its timing is so terrific. I  
8 think we must give credit to the fact that pressures  
9 had built up to the point that there was a tremendous  
10 need and it was a success for that reason.

11 Now I will say to you that need is not here  
12 today in any comparable size. The briefs you are  
13 getting, I would say, are tinkering. There are very  
14 few fundamental problems. I am not satisfied that  
15 schools is not one. There may be one or two others.  
16 They are not problems like sewers and water, the  
17 necessities of life, that were there when Metro came  
18 into being.

19 This is the reason we have taken so much  
20 of this brief to try and give you the feeling. I want  
21 you to grasp what was going on in the Metropolitan area  
22 at the time Metro came into being and what the pressures  
23 were, the reasons that this came into being. This is  
24 why you are given so much quotation, to try and give  
25 you some of the feeling. We say that is not the  
26 problem today.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: If I may interrupt,  
28 you are saying the problem was the provision of certain  
29 physical services?

30 MR. WEIR: That is right.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: And those physical  
2 services have been provided?

3 MR. WEIR: Yes, and are being provided  
4 in what has turned out to be a very efficient and  
5 effective way. When we look at the lack of these  
6 services in Metro when it was created and what is  
7 physically on the ground today it is a very impressive  
8 thing.

9 As I say I am not pretending to know what  
10 the reasons for it may be. Certain key commissions  
11 may have great men for some of these jobs. There is  
12 always so much human element in anything being a  
13 success.

14 Why do we want to tear it down? Why are  
15 there so many briefs to you? I ask you just to  
16 examine this. Is there something fundamentally wrong  
17 with Metro that we must make a clean sweep at this time?

18 I say to you that New Toronto wants to  
19 exist and continue to exist as a community. If you  
20 are advising that there are areas where the greater  
21 good can be achieved by wider contribution from the  
22 area municipalities we can accept that. We would still  
23 like to preserve our autonomy.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: You say some people want  
25 to break Metro down?

26 MR. WEIR: Yes, sir.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you consider that  
28 the formation of the borough system, the creation of a  
29 borough system would break Metro down?

30 MR. WEIR: Yes, sir.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: So you would say  
2 amalgamation would break Metro down?

3 MR. WEIR: Yes.

4 THE COMMISSIONER: You would put the  
5 creation of a borough system in the same category?

6 MR. WEIR: It is a question of how big  
7 a breakdown. The borough system will leave certain  
8 elements of autonomy for some municipalities. Scar-  
9 borough, presumably, would be relatively unchanged.  
10 It would make very little difference to Scarborough.  
11 It is almost big enough for one borough. It is not  
12 going to undergo any fundamental change. It would not  
13 make a difference if you said Scarborough would be a  
14 borough or said that we are going to change the police  
15 and fire functions. It is much the same thing to that  
16 community.

17 That is not true of the little municipali-  
18 ties. It may not be true of North York, which seems  
19 to be too big and consequently will have to be broken  
20 down. In terms of New Toronto it is wiping it out.  
21 It will become a district like Moore Park. It will  
22 cease to be a community in any political or municipal  
23 sense at all.

24 The boroughs are all cities in their own  
25 right of some considerable size. They are not turning  
26 into little cities like we see in eastern and western  
27 Ontario. They are turning them into cities like the  
28 larger cities of Ontario. For some political reason  
29 this may have an attraction.

30 Now we say this thing has been a success





1 and there is no terrible chaos or catastrophe that  
2 warrants tearing it down. We think you can make im-  
3 provements and we welcome improvements but we don't  
4 see any reason to break up the pattern of letting the  
5 community have a separate existence, of which ours is  
6 one and certainly Weston is another. Communities of  
7 that kind we see no reason that they should be sub-  
8 merged. We don't see any good reason to do it. No  
9 one has satisfied us that any great improvement will  
10 be accomplished by doing it.

11 I don't know whether there is any economy  
12 in substituting two clerks for two deputy clerks.  
13 Maybe there is some. I am sure it is awfully tough  
14 in your investigation to know whether it is better to  
15 have A and B in one place or two separate locations.  
16 No one seems to be able to answer that accounting or  
17 economic question in the true sense.

18 If you look at the figures you will see  
19 that we are not extravagant. We don't have too much  
20 or too little staff. We seem to be able to get along  
21 with a few heads of departments. There is a very direct  
22 relationship.

23 I appreciate your time is limited and I am  
24 keen that you have lots of time for questions. I don't  
25 want you to be pressed. I feel our value to you may  
26 be not as much in direct submission as being able to  
27 discuss with you the problem. Let me come to the  
28 point as quickly as I can. We do think that whatever  
29 solution you find it must take into account all of  
30 growing Metro itself. I think it would be very





1 dangerous if any change was made in Metro for inhi-  
2 biting the increase in the size.

3 Now this, we think, is important in its  
4 own right quite apart from whether you end up by  
5 submerging New Toronto in a borough or not. We do think  
6 this is an important consideration to keep alive. We  
7 do think it is worth putting forward and we do think  
8 it is important.

9 If you will consider Toronto Township it  
10 is growing rapidly and surrounding the airport with  
11 what is essentially an urban community. There is  
12 another urban group on the lakeshore. We think we  
13 are going to be back where Metro was in 1953 unless  
14 we make sure Metro can be a growing thing.

15 We think this is the great trouble with the  
16 concept of breaking things up into rigid boroughs. We  
17 would like to see every urban municipality on the  
18 periphery be capable of joining Metro and getting the  
19 advantages and disadvantages of being part of the  
20 overall planning but again being able to preserve some  
21 local autonomy and to overcome the political resistance  
22 that there would otherwise be.

23 It just would not be politically possible  
24 to annex Toronto Township, for instance, to a borough  
25 or something of that kind. No government could sur-  
26 vive that or would dare to try to do that. On the  
27 other hand, it might be very real to take the whole or  
28 some urbanized section with a definite community  
29 aspect, like Malton, into Metro as the fourteenth  
30 or fifteenth municipality.





1 We this this is another aspect of strength,  
2 letting the existing communities continue to perform  
3 the same function, to exist, and not create something  
4 that is nothing but artificial boundaries.

5 The next point is this: We see two major  
6 criticisms of Metro. One is representation. There  
7 is no question that people feel strongly the fact  
8 that New Toronto, for example, has one vote and North  
9 York has one vote at the Metropolitan Council. We  
10 recognize that and we agree with it. We don't think  
11 we should poll one-thirteenth of the voting power by  
12 any means.

13 Now we have two suggestions to you. I  
14 don't want, by putting them forward, to lead you to  
15 think that we have the only answer to this voting  
16 problem. We do think to solve the voting problem  
17 we certainly do not have to turn Metro into boroughs  
18 or amalgamate or anything else. That is a sort of  
19 solution where you throw the baby out with the bath.

20 If the problem is voting representation  
21 there are a variety of ways. We will mention two.  
22 I am sure you can think of several more all equally  
23 likely to work well.

24 The first one we say is this. I don't  
25 know what your views are on the efficiency of council  
26 size but someone at some point has to give considera-  
27 tion to what is the function of the modern municipal  
28 council. It should either be a board of directors  
29 settling policy on the recommendations of either one  
30 or more sort of general managers or heads or senior





1 heads of departments; or it should be, as it has been  
2 more traditionally in Ontario, a manager or set of  
3 managers to operate through their committees.

4 If you go to the smaller cities in Ontario,  
5 with the exception of Sarnia and Belleville, I think  
6 in most of those you find that the Chairman works  
7 through a committee and gets right into the question  
8 of what roads should be improved. There is no  
9 question of putting through council a report of the  
10 general manager on roads and having the council  
11 say that the policy is "We will spend so many thou-  
12 sands of dollars but you can decide where it goes."

13 Nobody has solved which of these two is  
14 desirable. Metro operates on a mixture of both.  
15 It is half committee and half not, I would say. There  
16 may be much to be said for the committee function and  
17 if there is then the Metropolitan Council is certainly  
18 too small.

19  
20 -

21  
22  
23 -

24  
25 -

26  
27  
28 -





1                   It is just not fair to the present people,  
2                   the thirteen who are elected, the twenty-six people  
3                   who are elected to Metropolitan Council, to expect  
4                   that they can operate a committee system form of  
5                   government, so that if in your view this is an  
6                   effective and proper way, then our solution number one  
7                   springs from it.

8                   We say leave New Yoronto with only one  
9                   member on the Metropolitan Council, but increase the  
10                  representation roughly on population from the larger  
11                  municipalities so that they elect not only a reeve  
12                  but maybe a number of deputy reeves -- I don't care  
13                  what name they are given -- deputy reeves in this  
14                  municipality have no function because we are not in a  
15                  county; it is only a title of honour as it were.   There  
16                  is no reason, for example, in North York if you work  
17                  out that their representation should be five that they  
18                  should not elect a deputy reeve or a reeve and four  
19                  deputy reeves who would be elected at large, would he  
20                  members of their own council, members of the Metro-  
21                  plitan Council, and be able to share the burden of  
22                  work; not only the burden of work in the council itself  
23                  but all these peripheral groups.

24                  I don't know whether they are a good thing  
25                  or not; I am not entering on that debate today, but  
26                  you have demands from the Metropolitan Council.   An  
27                  enormous number of things.   In the social welfare  
28                  field; all our hospitals are expected to have one  
29                  member of council sitting on the board; our Children's  
30                  Aid Societies are expected to have two members, yes,





1 two members of Metropolitan Council sitting on the  
2 boards. The old people's home.

3 Now, I think basically these are good  
4 things. I am not trying to decry that. For instance,  
5 in my own experience in Children's Aid work I can say  
6 I think it has been a very good thing that a Metro  
7 Councillor has been there -- I wouldn't like to say  
8 his attendance is one hundred per cent; I realize these  
9 men have a terrific job to get to these meetings, but  
10 it is a good thing there is someone on the Metropolitan  
11 Council who has some vague idea of what goes on in  
12 the Children's Aid Societies, which, between them, have  
13 a budget of over \$3 million.

14 Now, I certainly feel much can be achieved  
15 by increasing the size of this Council to the point  
16 where one fellow could go to the Children's Aid  
17 Society and one to the hospital at the same time. If  
18 you look at their set of duties, they could do nothing  
19 in each period from eight in the morning until mid-  
20 night but go to a meeting somewhere, including a  
21 lunch and dinner.

22 I think this is an unfair burden on them at  
23 the present time, and I think it is a burden that could  
24 be spread and effectively spread. Even if you are not  
25 thinking in terms of the committee aspect, I think the  
26 liaison aspect to the various groups of this kind is  
27 very desirable to preserve. Now, the second alter-  
28 native and the one that was originally suggested by Mr.  
29 Cumming in the original Metro Report, that was the  
30 concept that we preserve a small council, and presumably





1 we preserve it on a city manager theory. I don't  
2 think Mr. Cumming had in mind there would be a peripheral  
3 number of committees when he thought of the small coun-  
4 cil. Maybe he did, I don't know, but it certainly  
5 does not appear whether he did or not. However, with  
6 a city manager system, board of directors, then of  
7 course twenty, twenty-six is a very sensible number.  
8 It is the biggest number you would want if there is  
9 going to be a board of directors getting one or more  
10 general manager's report and doing nothing but dealing  
11 with major aspects of policy.

12 Now, if that is the system, then New Toronto  
13 recognizes that it is only entitled to a third or fifth  
14 of the vote on something, and it would go back to Mr.  
15 Cumming's suggestion that a number of these small  
16 municipalities sit together and elect one member to  
17 Metro.

18 We think out of this has come a good level  
19 of Metropolitan Councillors in the past. Certainly  
20 this may be one of the successes of Metro that they  
21 have been a surprising level, and you just look at the  
22 record: there were some wonderful decisions that were  
23 made in Metro far and beyond the self-interest of the  
24 individual municipality. You can go back on the old  
25 water decision, and things of this kind. We have had  
26 some very statesmanlike acts on the part of city and  
27 suburban representatives on the Metro Council. We  
28 heard about the one of the School Board this morning  
29 that was held up in this same way.

30 Now, sir, this thing has worked, and the





1 last thing we say about it is this: we think part of  
2 the reason it has worked is because this liaison  
3 aspect has been very high. You have had some exper-  
4 ience in Winnipeg I understand, or looked at it. I  
5 don't know enough about it to do more than repeat  
6 something secondhand, but I am led to believe from  
7 statements I have heard that mainly one of the reasons  
8 -- I would say only one; there are many others -- that  
9 I think it is fair to say Winnipeg has not been as  
10 successful as Metro due to the fact that the councillor  
11 had no tie-in with the local council. I don't know how  
12 important this is today, but I can tell you in the  
13 early history of Metro it was terribly important.

14 The reeve of North York went down to  
15 Metro and they debated whether the sewer collector  
16 would go up the Don Valley, which would have been  
17 of great service to East York and they had to wait in  
18 North York, or whether it went up another valley where  
19 it would have given more immediate service to North  
20 York.

21 Now, in the debate at the Metro Council  
22 he no doubt made strong and clear statements that it  
23 was a scandal and a crime if it didn't come up the  
24 west side where it would service North York first.

25 But he did hear the debate; he heard the experts from  
26 planning and from the sewer and water areas explaining  
27 their reasons for recommending that it go up the Don  
28 Valley first. While I am sure his public statements  
29 at Metro were consistent with the position of his  
30 local municipality, when he went back to North York and





1 sat with his local councillors who were inclined to  
2 scream about the terrible inequity of it going up the  
3 Don Valley, he was able to do some kind of explanatory  
4 work to indicate that it really wasn't all black and  
5 white, and that there were these reasons, and he  
6 prevented that council from becoming a lobby or a  
7 picket or something of this kind. He recognized  
8 the decision and accepted it as "We had our day in  
9 court and didn't win."

10 I think that liaison function to the  
11 existing municipalities has been a great success, and  
12 is one of the reasons for the success of Metro. We  
13 would hate to see it go. Even if you go to boroughs  
14 we think that there still should be the double function  
15 in the Council, not a separate group of Metropolitan  
16 Councillors for the reasons I am giving you. That  
17 is the background of that recommendation.

18 Lastly, sir, let me say to you that New  
19 Toronto recognizes that if there is to be some borough  
20 system -- and we couldn't be more against it -- that  
21 undoubtedly our community of interest if it could be  
22 called that probably lies with Etobicoke. We must  
23 confess this.

24 I understand the Etobicoke brief suggests  
25 the borough system which would include this municipi-  
26 pality, and let me say if the house had burned down  
27 we would recognize or be forced to recognize that if  
28 we are homeless we are probably better off in Etobicoke  
29 than anywhere else; but only if we are homeless, if I  
30 can put it that way.





1 We see no purpose in a lakeshore municipi-  
2 pality of three communities. That would be still too  
3 small. It achieves nothing in our view. Absolutely  
4 nothing. New Toronto is more different from  
5 Mimico and Long Branch or just as different as it is  
6 from any of the other thirteen. We don't see any  
7 particular purpose or point in that. We think there  
8 is a place for New Toronto, for Mimico and for Etobicoke.  
9 We think you should solve these problems that have  
10 arisen on representation, but we think that is the  
11 basic problem. Now, one last point ---

12 THE COMMISSIONER: May I ask a question  
13 now?

14 MR. WEIR: Certainly.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Why would you prefer  
16 to be homeless in an enlarged Etobicoke than in an  
17 enlarged Toronto, an amalgamated Toronto?

18 MR. WEIR: I think, sir, partly because  
19 if we are going to be homeless it is easier to take  
20 the thought of being homeless with another half million  
21 than it is with two million. I think I can say our  
22 council would say "Well, the bigger this thing gets  
23 the more lost we are."

24 Consequently, if it was a choice between  
25 ten boroughs or twelve boroughs, we would take twelve  
26 simply because there is whatever little hope we have  
27 of preserving the small community, and as I say per-  
28 sonally I think this is a lost cause. I think if we  
29 go into Etobicoke we will be pretty darn lost in the  
30 sense that our community is too small when you think of





1 the size of Etobicoke. Not only the size, but the  
2 potential size of Etobicoke. If you look at the kind  
3 of development that takes place in Etobicoke every  
4 day, it would lead you to believe that its acreage  
5 becomes literally filled up; it is going to be a  
6 tremendous size. No question. People who had no  
7 connection with Etobicoke a week or a month ago.

8 Now, this is not true of New Toronto.  
9 People are born, live and die in New Toronto.

10 Now, our last point. Mr. Gathercole talks  
11 about economic imbalance, and it has been picked up  
12 as a phrase by I don't know how many of these briefs,  
13 but it is certainly pre-talk before you were appointed.  
14 It was the big cry, the terrible economic imbalance.

15 Mr. Gathercole picks on it --  
16 in fact his idea of borough is really based on some  
17 idea not only of population but trying to wiggle it  
18 so he gets comparable assessment or something.

19 I am not sure I know what economic imbalance  
20 is. If we are talking of taxing per capita, the more  
21 you delve into that the more you find it is a very  
22 blunt tool to decide what is the burden on the people,  
23 because, you see, when you get into per capita assess-  
24 ment, you are starting to equate the five hundred  
25 people or so who are in Kensington Towers or one of  
26 the big apartment complexes -- like the one on Lowther,  
27 for instance -- you are equating them with the man  
28 with the small assessment in the smallest house and  
29 four children. The per capita tool in my respectful  
30 submission is a very poor one. On the other hand it





1 is hard to find a tool; I concede that it is hard to  
2 find a tool.

3 If you took assessment per school child  
4 you might come as close to a tool as you could find  
5 to indicate what the relative you might say burden as  
6 against ability to pay is. That is really what we  
7 are talking about. Presumably in economic imbalance  
8 we are talking about the burden that is on the  
9 community as compared with the ability to pay.

10 You see, to get any appropriate tool you  
11 would have to go to income tax, some sort of graduated  
12 tool based not on the number of square feet of  
13 property or whether you live in a good house or poor  
14 apartment; and you know in all our cities we have  
15 people with the largest ability to pay living in very  
16 modest apartment houses and making the smallest indivi-  
17 dual contribution to the municipal government.

18 We don't know what the answer to this is.  
19 I do think maybe assessment per school pupil is as close  
20 as you can come to a standard, a guide, some tool to  
21 try and find this out.

22 Now, this leads<sup>us</sup> to recognize that in this  
23 area, if that is the right area to consider this thing,  
24 New Toronto would not be adverse, has never been ad-  
25 verse to the compensating grant that someone gave you  
26 this morning, the new formula, to try to achieve this  
27 kind of development. New Toronto would not object  
28 in any way to that kind of thing to work out something.

29 On the other hand, we do not believe that  
30 economic imbalance is overcome by amalgamation, for





1 instance, or the borough, in any sense whatsoever because  
2 it is a function of so many things. You go  
3 through the assessment picture in Metro and you will  
4 find this; the market price of new homes on the  
5 periphery are a lower percentage of the total cost, for  
6 example, than the more expensive older homes in the  
7 city. Why? Because the assessor recognizes the  
8 ability to pay has to play a part, and the new home-  
9 owner burdened down with new mortgages and high cost  
10 of acquisition because of the burdens of sewers, and  
11 sewage contributions and such, of necessity can't  
12 meet quite the same amount as the older one who has  
13 been settled in, and if he has a reasonably expensive  
14 house in the older part of the city probably can  
15 meet his tax bill without very much fuss.

16 Now, economic adjustment and balance is  
17 a function of all these odds and ends, and it is quite  
18 unfair in our submission to talk of New Toronto as  
19 a rich community as such. The ability to bear taxes  
20 on our citizens is probably considerably lower than  
21 the average of the whole of the Metropolitan area.  
22 And to say that they should bear the same taxes per  
23 capita as people who live in Lawrence Park and Moore  
24 Park or something would be the greatest injustice one  
25 could perpetrate on them. Yet when you hear about  
26 economic imbalance, this is what they are saying.

27 Leaside had much the same kind of condition.  
28 There are a great many people of very modest incomes  
29 who live in the Town of Leaside just as there are in  
30 New Toronto. Ours is basically a workingman's





1 community. We don't have many executives living in  
2 New Toronto. Our people are the people who work in  
3 the plants, and while they receive the relatively  
4 good pay, if you can call it that, of workingmen today  
5 as compared with twenty years ago, they are still,  
6 compared with a big part of the Metropolitan community,  
7 people of modest income. Every time this business  
8 of "New Toronto is a rich community" is put out, this  
9 is invariably ignored.

10 One wants to grab at the suggestion that it  
11 is the percentage of industrial assessment over your  
12 percentage of residential which determines whether  
13 you are rich or poor. I say to you with respect  
14 this is the most unhappy tool that was ever invented  
15 simply because it makes sense only in one area, and  
16 that is in the area of schools. All you can say is  
17 if twenty-five homes are built in our community, this  
18 is likely<sup>to</sup>/produce two and one-sixteenth school children  
19 or some statistical number, but if twenty-five factories  
20 of equal assessment come into the community we won't  
21 have any number of children; therefore we are richer  
22 than the fellow who has all homes. That is all that  
23 theory means. When applied to the other public  
24 services it means nothing at all.

25 Your factories may put burdens on you  
26 for roads and all these other things that are certainly  
27 equal to residential. So if we can solve to some  
28 extent at least Metro-wide, and maybe we should be  
29 solving it province-wide in education, that there  
30 should be the same number of dollars available to





1 educate every child in Ontario, I think it would be  
2 very hard to quarrel with ~~that~~ proposition, and maybe  
3 Mr. Robarts' new foundation plan is going along in that  
4 direction. But no one could quarrel with you where you  
5 wanted to equalize education costs across Ontario or  
6 across Metro, and if that was accomplished by grant  
7 formula or new mathematical or common assessment for  
8 schools or something of this kind, New Toronto certainly  
9 would not object, and we would answer any question about  
10 this economic imbalance based on percentage of resi-  
11 dential as against industrial assessment because in  
12 my respectful submission to you, sir, that tool is  
13 only meaningful in terms of education. It is not  
14 meaningful anywhere else.

15 Take a factory community, and look at  
16 welfare and all these other things, and they tend,  
17 if anything, to be higher than, say, Forest Hill which  
18 has no industry. You take the school question out  
19 of Forest Hill and it is certainly much the richest  
20 community in Metropolitan Toronto. It has no indus-  
21 trial assessment at all, but this is because it has  
22 the ability to pay of its residents. It happens to  
23 be a community of people who generally enjoy above  
24 average rather than below average income. This is  
25 what makes it able to have a very high standard of  
26 municipal service, as it is, without any factories.

27 I think we have said enough, sir, for a  
28 very small municipality with a very small voice, and  
29 not wanting to suggest that our views should bear more  
30 than the weight of our size as compared to the other





1 thirteen, and we only ask you to accept them insofar  
2 as you would accept any of our views on the basis  
3 of the inherent reasonability and not because it  
4 comes from New Toronto.

5 We recognize and I want it to be made  
6 clear to you we do not pretend we are the tail that  
7 should wag the dog. We recognize we are small. We  
8 just want to remain a small, little, relatively unim-  
9 portant community where people can in one place in  
10 the Metropolitan area -- where people can get born,  
11 live and die, and again I say there does not seem to  
12 be any other municipality that they can do that.

13  
14 -

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 -

20  
21  
22  
23 -

24  
25  
26  
27 -





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much,  
2 Mr. Weir.

3 MR. WEIR: We are here to answer questions.  
4 I have a group of people and if you will ask me I will  
5 ask whoever is best able to cope with your question to  
6 answer it for you.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr. Weir, I think the  
8 only questions I have were those that I put to you  
9 as we went along.

10 MR. WEIR: Thank you, sir.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: You presented the case  
12 very thoroughly. I was particularly glad that you  
13 dealt with the per capita statistics a great number  
14 of which are before me.

15 MR. WEIR: Yes, I realize that, sir.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: I am very interested  
17 in your comments, sir. If either of the people with  
18 you would like to add anything you are welcome to do  
19 so.

20 MR. WEIR: I think Councillor Baycroft  
21 would like to add something.

22 MR. BAYCROFT: I would like to say adding  
23 to what Mr. Weir has said that in New Toronto I have  
24 been a member of council for some fifteen years and  
25 I have seen mayors come and go. I am sorry the  
26 mayor could not be here with us today. But we have  
27 in New Toronto all the correspondence, similar corres-  
28 pondence that goes to Scarbrough or Etobicoke. We  
29 have today in our council similar work all the way  
30 through that they do.





1 We are closer to our people because we  
2 are a small municipality. We know every street. We  
3 know anything that needs to be done. Several  
4 councillors know about it, not just one, and we do  
5 things much quicker possibly than you would have them  
6 done in a large municipality.

7 I think we are the grass roots of municipal  
8 government. When you get into the province you get  
9 away from the people. The federal is much further  
10 again away from the people and a large city like Toronto  
11 also has a tendency to get away from the smaller por-  
12 tions or the insignificant portions of the city.

13 I feel that our mayor when he goes to  
14 Metro is much more able to take the jobs, the committees  
15 that they throw at him than possibly a member of the  
16 City of Toronto, because he has had experience in  
17 every different department of government. Our  
18 government is exactly the same, as I said before, as  
19 takes place in Etobicoke, but I am sure that the  
20 Reeve of Etobicoke would have to be there for some  
21 time before he would get the varied experience that  
22 the mayor in New Toronto would get in a short time.

23 A mayor goes to a Metro Council and he knows  
24 from our own council the problems that other munici-  
25 palities have and as a representative, just because it  
26 is a small part of Metro, I think his voice is just  
27 as loud -- could be just as loud as a person's from  
28 a large municipality. The only thing is that being  
29 from a small municipality I think you go down to Metro  
30 with the feeling that our town is so small that my





1 weight is not as big as Etobicoke's. So possibly we  
2 might have to fight harder. But they do talk about  
3 the same things and know what they are talking about  
4 in the small municipalities just as well as the large.

5 I personally cannot understand how in  
6 Etobicoke the council which has just a few more than  
7 we have in New Toronto could run the varied problems  
8 of a large municipality like that and be close to  
9 what they wish. I think if we had more of the  
10 smaller municipalities in Metro or a larger number of  
11 boroughs it would be better all around because there  
12 would be more people closer to the electors who elect  
13 them into the offices.

14 I think that is all I have to say.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you.

16 MR. WEIR: I think that is all we have to  
17 say to you, sir. We thank you very much for the time  
18 you have given us and the attention you have paid us.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: We will now adjourn  
20 until two o'clock.

21  
22 ---Luncheon adjournment.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 ---Upon resuming at 2.00 p.m.

2  
3 SUBMISSION OF  
4 THE TOWN OF MIMICO

5 Appearances:

6 Mr. Hugh M. Griggs

Mayor

7  
8 -----

9  
10 THE COMMISSIONER: Mayor Griggs, are  
11 you ready to proceed?

12 MR. GRIGGS: Yes, sir.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You are for Mimico.

14 MR. GRIGGS: Mr. Commissioner, I have been  
15 delegated by the Town of Mimico Council to present the  
16 brief of Mimico. With me today there is the clerk  
17 and several of the members of council.

18 I do not propose repeating what is in the  
19 brief. I have supplied you with some comments which  
20 I want to stress are somewhat personal. The main ones,  
21 of course, deal with the brief as presented by the  
22 Town of Mimico, but I have added some personal ones or  
23 expanded some of the suggestions -- if that is satis-  
24 factory with you, sir?

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure.

26 MR. GRIGGS: In starting I would wish to  
27 go to the very back page of our brief which is a summary,  
28 or the conclusions. That is page 12.

29 "In summary we wish to emphasize to the  
30 Commission that Mimico vigorously supports the





1 Metropolitan system of municipal government.  
2 We are convinced that it provides the best  
3 method of dealing with those overall problems  
4 and services affecting all member municipalities,  
5 at the same time ensuring democratic local  
6 governments who are responsible to the people  
7 in each area for their local services. It  
8 results in the people being involved in and in  
9 control of their local government administra-  
10 tion" --

11 which we think is very vital.

12 "We believe that the Metropolitan  
13 government needs certain reforms including  
14 changes in electoral representation which  
15 would ensure direct democratic control by the  
16 citizens. We believe that there should be  
17 some representation which cuts across munici-  
18 pal boundaries, thus not only reducing friction  
19 between municipalities but preventing the  
20 political jockeying" --

21 and stalemate --

22 "-- that is now prevalent in Metropolitan Council.

23 Our main points here; we have numbered  
24 them. We definitely oppose amalgamation! We  
25 definitely favour the retention of the Metro-  
26 politan form of administration. We definitely  
27 favour implementation of a more equitable  
28 representation on Metropolitan Toronto Council.  
29 We definitely advocate a revamping of trans-  
30 portation and police services. We definitely





1 favour the continuance of the existing educa-  
2 tional system with the exception of the method  
3 of financing. We definitely consider that  
4 before any further subsidization be made in  
5 connection with the TTC a vote should be taken  
6 of the people. We feel it is for the people  
7 to decide whether they are going to pay the  
8 extra on a fare basis or on a tax basis. We  
9 think that is only fair.

10 We point out there: "We did not take  
11 time to make this a mathematical study as we  
12 feel the Commissioner" --

13 you, sir, --

14 "with expert help and statistics at his  
15 disposal will no doubt be more qualified to  
16 do this" than we would be. We feel that you  
17 will have all kinds of assistance dealing with the  
18 problems facing Metro.

19 Now in running over the brief, it is not  
20 our intention to take up time in recapitulating material  
21 in the body of the Mimico brief. It would appear more  
22 desirable to elaborate briefly on a few of the  
23 recommendations contained in the brief's closing  
24 paragraphs.

25 On page 4 we refer to Metro representation  
26 and I would like to just take a moment or two to  
27 expand what we suggest. This is on page 4. We say:  
28 "We submit that the Metropolitan Council should be  
29 composed of members of the area councils; one repre-  
30 sentative for the first 50,000 or less of population





1 in each municipality plus one representative for each  
2 additional 50,000 of population. The top-ranking  
3 members of each area council should be representatives  
4 on the Metropolitan Council."

5 The next one is what is maybe some new  
6 thinking on the matter. "In addition, and in order  
7 to provide independent thinking on the Council, advan-  
8 tage should be taken of the provincial machinery and  
9 elect as members of the Metropolitan Council one member  
10 from each provincial electoral riding in the Metro-  
11 politan area as it exists from time to time or from  
12 a reasonable or feasible combination of such ridings."

13 Our council did not spell this out, but  
14 they left it to you, Mr. Commissioner. I have per-  
15 sonally taken the liberty of suggesting a combination  
16 of Metro's 29 legislative ridings giving 9 regional  
17 representatives or a Metro Council of about 42 members.  
18 This should give additional independent thinking and  
19 end deadlock by city/suburban splits in Council  
20 voting, as these representatives would not only com-  
21 bine existing municipalities but they would combine  
22 existing constituencies. I shall deal with that in  
23 the notes supplementing the brief.

24 I think the first of these that may need  
25 further explanation is that which refers to the need  
26 for more equitable representation of the member  
27 municipalities in the Metropolitan Council. It is  
28 general knowledge that the existing arrangement is  
29 wholly out of balance, that population or even  
30 assessment bears no proper relationship to voting





1 power. It seems advisable in any review of the  
2 structure of the Metropolitan area to bring into being  
3 a recommendation to integrate with any modification  
4 of the municipal structure a new basis of representation  
5 more thoroughly related to population in the areas  
6 affected. Our Council has suggested that representa-  
7 tion should be considered on a basis of one for each  
8 50,000 of population, and so on.

9 In addition to this Council has in general  
10 terms put forth the suggestion that some sort of  
11 representation be set up on a regional arrangement such  
12 as a combination of existing electoral districts in  
13 which voting organization already exists. That is at  
14 the provincial level, of course. The purpose of this  
15 type of representation is to cover an area not merely  
16 local.

17 I have personally -- and I stress that  
18 "personally" because the Council itself did not go  
19 into this -- I have personally gone further into this  
20 by suggesting that the 29 electoral districts be  
21 arranged in 9 regions each with approximately 100,000  
22 voters. This scheme would, it is hoped, offset  
23 the local rivalry atmosphere which seems to inflict  
24 itself upon deliberations in the existing Metropolitan  
25 Council.

26 As I have said, I have taken the liberty  
27 of offering in support of this suggestion a map indi-  
28 cating the proposed regions with details of the  
29 municipal areas composing them and the electoral dis-  
30 tricts of which they are comprised, and notations of





1 the relative voting totals.

2 The suggested regional set-up consists of  
3 eight regions of three electoral districts each and one  
4 of five. The reason we have combined it that way is  
5 to get within that voting strength of about 100,000 in  
6 each one.

7 Two of the regions are wholly within the  
8 City of Toronto, three are composed of part city and  
9 part suburban areas and four are made up of local  
10 areas completely outside the City of Toronto.

11 I have included here a map and suggested  
12 names -- the combinations and suggested names and so  
13 on for the regions. I might say we had a bit of fun  
14 playing around with the names.

15 In other words, Mimico proposes a solution  
16 to the city/suburbs deadlock which occurs on many  
17 occasions in Metropolitan Council voting. That is,  
18 by these extra ones. But, as I say, Council did not  
19 set out any specific combinations.

20 The general members would serve on Metro  
21 Council giving a municipal cross-section view of  
22 problems as they affect the region, ensuring inde-  
23 pendent thinking. They could be called upon by  
24 local councils to give their standpoint on issues  
25 affecting all municipalities within their region.

26 I shall not go further into the analysis  
27 of this map that I have supplied, nor the division.  
28 It is fairly self-evident.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: If I understand you  
30 correctly, you would have nine directly elected members





1 to Council and the remainder appointed by the area  
2 councils?

3 MR. GRIGGS: The others would be elected  
4 as they are now.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

6 MR. GRIGGS: With the heads of the municipi-  
7 palities serving except in those cases where the large  
8 municipalities would have more than the heads. They  
9 might have the first two members of the board of  
10 control like the City of Toronto does now; although I  
11 dare say under the present system the City of Toronto  
12 does not need to name the second two controllers --  
13 the two controllers. These men are elected. They  
14 cannot think of Mimico or New Toronto. They have to  
15 think of a whole area. We try to do that now anyway,  
16 but we do have many occasions, as past experience has  
17 shown, where the city is almost voting in an entire  
18 blockone way and the suburbs in another. We think  
19 that these additional representatives would do away  
20 with this. Besides at the present time the suburban  
21 municipalities' population is considerably greater  
22 than that of the city and I do not think the city  
23 should any longer be entitled to an equal repre-  
24 sentation on the Metro Council.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting  
26 in effect a combination of the existing system in  
27 Toronto and the system in Winnipeg where the members  
28 of Metro Council are elected by metropolitan districts  
29 -- special wards?

30 MR. GRIGGS: I am not too familiar with





1 the Winnipeg situation.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: That is what it is.

3 MR. GRIGGS: These are extra what we call,  
4 not exactly floating members, but additional members.  
5 But they would have just the same power as the mayor  
6 or the controller that was elected, or the other  
7 representatives elected to represent their area.

8 Research-taxation method: This is some-  
9 thing that I have added in myself. I feel that  
10 research on the whole system of taxation -- and I am  
11 sure my council agrees with this -- should be undertaken  
12 with a view to devising a new approach which would  
13 relieve from the municipal field those financial charges  
14 not properly related to the operation of municipal  
15 administration, maintenance and services but which are  
16 now levied through taxes on real property.

17 Taxes which do not bear true relationship  
18 to property ownership, I submit in my opinion, include  
19 education, general welfare and the administration of  
20 justice -- and probably some others. Some other form  
21 of financing should be introduced to cover all of  
22 these, since the extent to which they enter into the  
23 public domain is so much greater than when the basis  
24 of municipal taxation was first set up.

25 In this connection it would appear desir-  
26 able to explore the possibility of the development by  
27 the province of certain suitable tracts of Crown-owned  
28 lands whose resources would contribute financially to  
29 the provision of revenue with which to assist at least  
30 education, welfare and administration of justice.





1 By that I mean this province has got a  
2 tremendous lot of Crown-owned land. I do not think it  
3 is enough just to come up here and say that there  
4 should be a change but to make some practical proposals.  
5 I am saying take a large section of our Crown-owned lands,  
6 which undoubtedly will have natural resources, develop  
7 them and earmark the revenue from them for these  
8 basic overall services.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: This, of course, is  
10 outside of my Terms of Reference. It is now being  
11 studied by the Ontario Committee on Taxation.

12 MR. GRIGGS: I realize that is a possibility;  
13 but I do think that you, sir, must look over the whole  
14 proposition. I would think that probably the pro-  
15 vincial government would be looking for ideas as to  
16 how this could be done. We should not just say:  
17 "Give us more money", without saying: "How can we  
18 raise it?" I feel that there is something basically  
19 wrong when one body spends sums for the levying of  
20 which another body has sole responsibility.

21 -

22 -

23 -





1 For instance, in a lot of our municipali-  
2 ties the cost of education is at least half of your  
3 levy and still the body that spends on education,  
4 and they certainly have to do it, I realize money  
5 must be spent, but the Council is the one that has  
6 to levy it.

7 In the matter of education it seems clear  
8 that young people are not being afforded educational  
9 opportunities for the sole benefit of the municipality  
10 in which they were resident when educated. Many of  
11 them go much further afield. Their usefulness as  
12 educated persons is a national one, not something  
13 for the development of which any municipality should  
14 have to accept responsibility, financially or other  
15 wise.

16 Inasmuch as education is constitutionally  
17 a provincial matter, its administration in all cases  
18 should be the concern of the province, therefore  
19 the province should find the funds with which to  
20 carry it on.

21 This is not specifically in the brief but  
22 I have heard members say this on many occasions.

23 I have a couple of personal comments. If  
24 home ownership is taxed out of existence we will be  
25 losing one of the very fundamentals of democracy, that  
26 of the security produced as a result of home owner-  
27 ship.

28 In connection with the administration of  
29 education, I would suggest that consideration be given  
30 to the election of a new type of public representative,





1 who would be elected and serve on both the local  
2 municipal council and on the Board of Education.  
3 Council members would then understand the problems of  
4 the educators and the latter would be better informed  
5 on municipal administration and responsibilities.

6 I have put in brackets that such a position would be  
7 difficult to fill. It is like walking a tight rope.  
8 I believe there are individuals who could fill such  
9 a hybrid post.

10 It would be necessary to make the remunera-  
11 tion attractive enough so that a qualified person could  
12 devote all or most of his time to the position. The  
13 reason for that is in a large municipality the com-  
14 plexities of administration are so great it takes con-  
15 siderable time.

16 There is another suggestion that I have  
17 tossed in. I don't know whether it is within your  
18 Terms of Reference or not. I think the time has long  
19 since passed when large urbanized municipalities should  
20 be termed a township for provincial grant reasons.

21 I know from experience in the past that municipalities  
22 would have had themselves incorporated into cities but  
23 if they had done so the cost would have been so great,  
24 by loss of grants. I think that is a question of  
25 ironing out grants and it should be on a different  
26 basis than on the name of a municipality.

27 Let us more clearly define and apply the  
28 proper classification to the municipality so that a  
29 township will no longer remain technically a township  
30 when in fact it has become instead a town or city.





1 Now I would deal with transportation.

2 In public transportation we should undertake exten-  
3 sive research into the whole field, with special  
4 stress on commuter railway service. I think some  
5 study is being done now. Thought should be given  
6 to the utilization of Lake Ontario for such trans-  
7 portation vehicles, including hovercraft, that are  
8 now being developed. I think it will not be too  
9 long before that new type of vehicle will revolution-  
10 ize the whole field.

11 Now I would just like to turn to page 8  
12 of the brief, sir. Mimico claims that in examining  
13 many of the effects from change in the Metropolitan  
14 structure regard must be given to the effects on  
15 the tax structure of our municipality.

16 Amalgamation must also be examined  
17 from the viewpoint of the debt structure in all the  
18 Metropolitan municipalities, as well as the situation  
19 prevailing in the established services in each. These  
20 vary from municipality to municipality. They may  
21 vary from any number of reasons such as differences  
22 in age, rates of growth, industrial concentration,  
23 planning practices and financial policies.

24 For example Mimico for years has followed  
25 the policy of "pay as you go" financing. We are a  
26 built-up, long-established, compact community, with  
27 very little debt. In that connection I might say  
28 that our municipal debt, just the debt for which the  
29 municipality has been responsible, is \$282,400. That  
30 will be paid up in 1967. Of course, to that must





1 be added a share of the Metropolitan debt, which is  
2 \$440,303. Then there is the balance of the Mimico  
3 debt assumed by Metro in 1954 of \$124,000.

4 We are opposed to the principle of a  
5 change other than to iron out inequities. We feel  
6 by doing without a great many things that we probably  
7 should have had or might have had we have kept down  
8 the debt until Mimico has one of the lowest debenture  
9 debts of any municipality in Metropolitan Toronto, if  
10 not the lowest.

11 We do not feel that under any reassembly  
12 under some new scheme that our people should be burden-  
13 ed with additional taxes for debts on things which  
14 they had no part in creating.

15 Now on page 10 of our brief, sir, we have  
16 listed there three alternatives dealing with the  
17 question of transportation. I will start with sub-  
18 section (5).

19 It is quite apparent that the Metropolitan  
20 Council should have more direct control over the  
21 Toronto Transit Commission, or the transportation  
22 system. It has always been considered important  
23 that the operation of the system be kept out of  
24 municipal politics. While this is still desirable,  
25 we must face the fact that the control should be  
26 where the financing comes from. Millions of dollars  
27 are being poured into the system every year by the  
28 taxpayers throughout the whole of Metropolitan Toronto.

29 Three alternatives are suggested:

30 (a) a majority of the Commissioners should





1 be members of the Metropolitan Council;

2 (b) the Toronto Transit Commission should  
3 be operated by a general manager under three or more  
4 of the Commissioners of other departments of Metro-  
5 politan Toronto including the finance commissioners.

6 There is one recommendation left out.  
7 The transportation system should be a department of  
8 Metro similar to the other departments under a  
9 commissioner.

10 That, sir, is our main brief. We appre-  
11 ciate this opportunity of giving verbal recommendations  
12 and we shall be glad to try and answer your questions,  
13 sir.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: I just have a few  
15 questions, Mayor Griggs. On page 2 of your brief,  
16 the second to the last paragraph, you say some  
17 reservation should be made in regard to certain  
18 other services, such as certain aspects of welfare  
19 service recently assumed by the Metropolitan govern-  
20 ment.

21 Has the Metropolitan Council assumed  
22 certain welfare services recently?

23 MR. GRIGGS: Yes, they have. They have  
24 assumed them and we feel that the local welfare officer  
25 is closer allied to the situation.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: My understanding is  
27 that Metro will now pay the compulsory services  
28 under the Public Assistance Act. That is that  
29 has become a financial responsibility of Metro but  
30 that Metro has not assumed any of the administration.





1 Am I wrong in that? I think I am right.

2 MR. GRIGGS: Well, I am not going to  
3 argue with you, sir. Our feeling is merely that the  
4 local people know the deserving cases, shall we say.  
5 We certainly wish to help the deserving cases.

6 In Toronto they have quite a structure  
7 set up. There are far more people looking after  
8 welfare in the City of Toronto, maybe nearly ten  
9 times as many as we have in the entire other twelve  
10 suburban municipalities. I think they have 500  
11 looking after this type of thing whereas we in our  
12 entire municipalities only have 40.

13 We feel that this is -- I hesitate to use  
14 the word extravagant -- we feel it is on a little  
15 more costly basis than we have it in our other  
16 municipalities. That is what we are referring to,  
17 as I understand it, when we think there should be  
18 some reservations.

19 We do realize we are relieved of some  
20 of the costs by this new move. We do know that in  
21 municipalities like ourselves it will still cost us  
22 more money, which may be socially justified. We do  
23 realize in some cases, of course, people come in  
24 from all over the province and they do not go to the  
25 suburban municipalities to such an extent as they do  
26 to the centre of the city.

27 Mimico longs for what is fair and equitable.  
28 We do think it could be handled more efficiently with  
29 officers who know the local situation and know the  
30 local people.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 3 of your  
2 brief you set out as one of the requirements for an  
3 area municipality that the scale of its resources must  
4 be big enough and balanced enough to support the full  
5 range of local municipal services.

6 Do you think smaller municipalities fit  
7 that requirement? I am including Mimico, of course.

8 MR. GRIGGS: I feel that if we were left  
9 alone as we are we are getting along fine. It de-  
10 pends on the viewpoint at which you look at it. Some  
11 people might not think we are carrying our share of  
12 the overall, whereas we think that we are. We think  
13 we can operate satisfactorily. We do not think the  
14 area should be split up.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Then on page 6 you say:  
16 "An examination of the cost of services in Mimico,  
17 when compared to costs in other larger municipalities,  
18 proves that our costs are no greater, and in fact  
19 are less than in some larger municipalities."

20 Have you compared the type and quality of  
21 services?

22 MR. GRIGGS: I would say that we give all  
23 the types of services that are required.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: By Mimico?

25 MR. GRIGGS: By the Mimico set-up. In  
26 some of the welfare cases they have hostels. We  
27 would not have one request in a year for the use of  
28 a hostel. That is an example.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Then in your con-  
30 clusions on page 12 you say: "We definitely advocate





1 a revamping of transportation and police services."

2 You have discussed transportation but  
3 you have said nothing about police services. Would  
4 you tell me what revamping you would recommend?

5 MR. GRIGGS: This is a recommendation put  
6 in by members of council. They feel that the police  
7 service, good and all as it is in a great many  
8 respects, they feel that in some respects it is not  
9 as good as when we were our own municipality and had  
10 our own officers and they did more foot patrol and  
11 so on. This is the feeling on that.

12 They think this thing should be gone over  
13 and that the services right within the municipality  
14 itself should be improved, shall I say.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, do they think  
16 the Metropolitan force should be abolished and re-  
17 placed by local forces?

18 MR. GRIGGS: No thought expressed along  
19 that line. The members of Mimico council have  
20 never indicated any such thing. Just improvement  
21 of it under the present set-up with a little greater  
22 local touch, shall we say.

23 THE COMMISSIONER: I know what you mean.

24 MR. GRIGGS: This is what we mean. We  
25 don't want in any way to criticize. We think it is a  
26 reasonably good police service. We do think it could  
27 be improved where you have a lot of break-ins and  
28 so on. It is pretty hard to catch this kind of an  
29 individual anyway but we feel that it could be im-  
30 proved. Our Council feels it could be improved.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much  
2 for your brief. I assume, Mayor Griggs, the people  
3 with you have nothing to add to what you have said?

4 MR. GRIGGS: They have indicated they  
5 wish to let our case stand on the brief.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Implicit confidence in  
7 the mayor. Is that it?

8 MR. GRIGGS: We would like to think that,  
9 sir!

10  
11  
12  
13 -

14  
15  
16  
17  
18 -

19  
20  
21  
22  
23 -





SUBMISSION OF  
THE CORPORATION OF THE VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH

Appearances:

Leonard E. Ford

Mayor

N. M. Simpson

Counsel

-----

MR. FORD: Mr. Commissioner, in presenting this brief on behalf of Long Branch I intend to speak around the brief and touch it at certain points. Concerning the waterfront our solicitor Mr. Simpson will take over from me if that is all right with you.

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

MR. FORD: Now I would like to go back to the beginning of the second tier of municipal government. Here in Ontario I believe it is about one hundred and fifteen years ago that the county system was set up and all municipalities became part of the county, or the county was divided into municipalities and the city was set aside as a separate unit. Certain towns in Ontario, such as Smiths Falls and Gananoque were separate towns and took no part in the county system.

The county system was given the services. That was all right in the nineteenth century before the mass communications appeared and the new modes of travel. The coming of the telegraph and the radio and television has changed that. There is also the factor of transportation. The railway did not do much damage because the railway had stations spread all





1 over and they became the nucleus of villages and  
2 towns, still part of the county system.

3 The advent of the motorcar was something  
4 quite different. The motorcar did not need a station  
5 and they enabled the people to work in the city and in  
6 the evening get away from it all out in the country,  
7 to have the best of two worlds.

8 That was all right in the beginning but  
9 after the Second War the increase in the registration  
10 of motorcars brought about a mass movement of people  
11 to the suburbs and began the period of expansion which  
12 I shall call the "urban sprawl". Nowhere in Ontario  
13 is that more evident than in the Toronto area.

14 By the end of the fifth decade, in the  
15 latter part of the 1940's, representations were made  
16 to the Ontario government to do something about the  
17 Toronto situation and the advent of Metro was brought  
18 about.

19 Metro is similar to the county system but  
20 different in the fact that the city becomes a part of it.  
21 I think that was the fundamental error of the county  
22 system.

23  
24  
25 -

26  
27 -

28  
29  
30 -





1                   The city was isolated, and because the  
2 city was isolated that is also the fault of Metropolitan  
3 Toronto. Years of isolation of the City of Toronto  
4 has brought to the representatives of the City of  
5 Toronto a feeling that they are being thrust into  
6 something they don't want whereas the representatives  
7 from the suburbs have been used to taking part in  
8 deliberations among municipalities.

9                   Of course, too, one of the greatest defects  
10 of the Metro system has been the equal representation  
11 with the City of Toronto and the suburbs, and the  
12 inclination of the city members to vote en bloc and  
13 to consider that Metro is only a stepping stone towards  
14 amalgamation, and endless debates in the Metro Council  
15 have stymied to some extent the usefulness that could  
16 be made of Metropolitan Council. So this is where  
17 we are at today.

18                  Now, I cannot in all fairness say that we  
19 should have the things as they are. It is very nice  
20 to have your own municipality and believe that is the  
21 best that there could be, but you have got to be  
22 truthful, and now is the time we must have in the  
23 Metro system a little bigger unit than the ten thousand  
24 or twelve thousand in Long Branch and Lakeshore muni-  
25 cipalities. However, it is I believe just as true  
26 that in this modern urban sprawling Metro area that  
27 we have, that one single council can't take care of the  
28 services that are needed. It has to be remembered  
29 today that services are demanded that were not in  
30 existence one hundred years ago. Water, hydro.





1 People in the country today, the people think they are  
2 necessities, and to some extent they are. Sanitary  
3 sewers are a necessity out in the suburban areas too,  
4 and that costs money. It not only costs money, but  
5 that takes something in regard to planning. Therefore  
6 just a group of small municipalities or some small and  
7 some large will not do the job either.

8 I think this is ample proof, and my council  
9 concurred -- I might say council is unanimous in this  
10 brief in the major details. That comes then to proof  
11 that we must have a two-level form of government, a  
12 Metro form of government, if you want to say that, but  
13 we believe that we should have units that are more  
14 equal in size; not necessarily exactly equal.

15 These municipalities should be guided by  
16 natural or artificial boundary lines like main railways  
17 or highways or in some cases watercourses. They may  
18 determine the size and extent of the municipality.  
19 We believe it is essential for the overall planning  
20 to have one council that is charged with the respon-  
21 sibility of that overall planning and then the other  
22 municipalities shall take up and apply the services that  
23 are provided by the Metropolitan Council; apply these  
24 services for the welfare of the people, and that the  
25 councils should be small enough that they are not  
26 only cognizant but also that they will fulfil the  
27 needs of the people. You will notice I say "needs".  
28 I don't say "wishes". I think that the council  
29 should determine as they see fit the needs of the  
30 people.





1 Now, in regard to the size of the municipi-  
2 pality, Long Branch believes that as you increase the  
3 size of the municipality you can increase the effi-  
4 ciency up to a certain point. On the other hand, as  
5 you increase the size, you lose contact with the people  
6 and you lose responsibility to the people. I mean  
7 responsiveness, not responsibility. Responsiveness  
8 to the needs of the people, and we think then one  
9 hundred thousand should be the limit. One hundred  
10 thousand population.

11 At the present time that does not mean  
12 that every municipality should have one hundred thousand  
13 because certain municipalities would have to expand  
14 because they are now undeveloped, and also in the  
15 central core of Toronto where you have big business,  
16 buildings and that, where it is commercial and not  
17 many residential, it may not be necessary to have  
18 one hundred thousand for that purpose. The problems  
19 that they are confronted with are quite different  
20 from the problems that are confronting the residential  
21 areas.

22 We also believe that uniformity among  
23 municipalities is not desirable. Not complete uni-  
24 formity. We believe in variety where one municipality,  
25 depending on the character, has the right to develop  
26 as it sees fit, and as the electors vote.

27 Now, we have suggested in our brief, Mr.  
28 Commissioner, that the area municipalities council  
29 should consist of a mayor and eight councillors, and  
30 there should not be a board of control or an executive





1 board because we feel that one of the faults of the  
2 City of Toronto and one of the faults of the city is  
3 because it takes away the responsibility of conducting  
4 the affairs from the elected aldermen in the ward and  
5 it leaves nothing much more than sniping at the  
6 controllers or those who are charged with the financial  
7 responsibility of providing the money for the operation  
8 of the cities. I believe that is the cause today of  
9 the long sessions we have both at City Council and some-  
10 times at Metro. It is the political goings-on rather  
11 than attending to business that brings this about.

12 We believe, therefore, that the committee  
13 system with each member of council perhaps being  
14 charged with a committee however large or small -- with  
15 other members of course on the committee, and that is  
16 the reason for the nine -- you would not have to serve  
17 on too many committees. Say a committee of two or  
18 three, and you wouldn't have to have too many com-  
19 mittees to be on. For any less than nine would make  
20 it too onerous on members of Council to be on these  
21 committees.

22 We also believe that the mayor should be a  
23 member of the Metropolitan Council and it should be  
24 so stated on the ballot so the voters will know when  
25 they are voting for the mayor of a local municipality  
26 they are voting for a member of the Metropolitan  
27 Council. Also that the Chairman of the Metropolitan  
28 Council, which we debated yesterday, the Chairman shall  
29 be elected from those mayors that have been elected,  
30 that have been elected by the people at large, just the





1 same as any warden of a county in Ontario, or in fact  
2 just the same as the Premier of this province or the  
3 Prime Minister. They are not elected by the people;  
4 they are chosen by the party in power rather than  
5 elected by the people as such.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you repeal the  
7 provision of the Act which allows an outsider to be  
8 elected?

9 MR. FORD: I would think it would not be  
10 advisable to pick someone outside of municipal govern-  
11 ment. I wouldn't say it would necessarily have to  
12 be in the Council as long as he had experience in the  
13 municipal sphere. That would be a qualification.  
14 If you did pick an outsider, that would be a qualifi-  
15 cation. I don't think it would happen very much  
16 because I believe the mayors would feel that a member  
17 of their own body would have more knowledge of  
18 necessities than an outsider.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: I did not understand  
20 you clearly. I thought you were saying the chairman  
21 should be selected only from among members of the  
22 Council.

23 MR. FORD: I said he should be. We have  
24 it in our brief, but I personally would not object to  
25 it if he were an experienced municipal councillor, but  
26 outside of that I figure that it would be better to  
27 have him elected from the mayors.

28 One of the faults of the present Metro-  
29 politcan system -- and I have been a member only for a  
30 year and four months -- just a minute now, I have lost





1 the thread. One of the faults is that there is no  
2 really defined principle of jurisdiction between the  
3 local municipality and the Metro municipality. There  
4 are certain statutes put down, but there has been more  
5 time lost in Metropolitan Council by someone or other  
6 trying to either saddle on Metro some expense or some-  
7 thing that would take a financial burden off them  
8 rather than working on the principle that it really is  
9 an overall matter and should be belonging to the  
10 Metropolitan Council. They are just using the  
11 financial expediency to urge a change in the juris-  
12 diction from the area to the Metropolitan Council.

13 We have set out at the end of our brief  
14 in very short form some of the things which we have  
15 believed should be the function now. These are not  
16 elaborate. These are only guide posts, and we are  
17 fairly well satisfied with many of the divisions.

18 One of the exceptions, of course, is  
19 transportation and we believe that the TTC has not  
20 fulfilled the job they set out to do, the job it  
21 was set up to do. It has not provided the overall  
22 transportation necessary in suburban areas, and it  
23 has charged unfairly the suburban taxpayer with a  
24 double fare and with also a subsidy to pay for the  
25 deficits of the TTC and for the capital costs that  
26 are way beyond the use that the suburban citizen gets  
27 out of the service.

28 This I put down to the fact that the TTC  
29 administratively is no different from what it was before.  
30 where other Metropolitan services, the administration





1 was set up under the Metropolitan Council; whereas the  
2 TTC kept the old administration and they have not  
3 changed their thinking from the City of Toronto quorum,  
4 and to give transportation to the suburbs that it  
5 deserves.

6 We believe that transportation should be  
7 a department of Metro, and it should be all-inclusive;  
8 roads, TTC, commuter service, all that should be under  
9 one department of Metro or one committee of Metro.

10 In the police I would like too to say that  
11 we are not served nearly as well with police services  
12 as we were before Metro took it over. Now, it is true  
13 that they do a far better job on certain phases of it,  
14 and those phases of course are Metropolitan phases as  
15 I have said before, and each service like this should  
16 be defined. You don't say this service of police  
17 belongs to Metro and fire belongs to the local  
18 municipality; you say part belongs to Metro and part  
19 belongs to the local municipality, the same way with  
20 fire. There is hardly any service that can't be  
21 divided, and it is only on that boundary line where the  
22 division is where there is going to be conflict, and  
23 it is only on that boundary line that there should be  
24 any change in the legislation as set out. Whatever  
25 comes from this Commission and whatever legislation  
26 comes forward, changes should only be along that line  
27 of division. As circumstances change those lines  
28 should be moved either more to the Metropolitan Council  
29 or less to the Metropolitan Council, and it should not  
30 be a monetary expediency. It should be on political





1 justice or administrative justice.

2 We believe then that the protection of the  
3 local property, the policing of local roads and of, say,  
4 parking and so on should be returned to the municipality.  
5 Area municipalities. Likewise in licensing, and this  
6 is very important. It is a very sore spot among the  
7 many municipalities in which licences are granted now  
8 by an office down in the central part of the city, and  
9 of course they send out to us asking for approval of  
10 the licence, and we find the place is already operating.  
11 Then we have to look up and see whether it fulfills our  
12 rules or not, and then we send it back to Metro. We  
13 believe that the division there should be that those  
14 licences that have to do with people who move about,  
15 taxicabs, electricians and those should be a Metro-  
16 politan responsibility while the licences for local  
17 stores and businesses do not move; they are part of the  
18 municipality and have to comply with the municipal by-  
19 laws. They should be returned to the local municipi-  
20 pality.

21 The Metro Planning Board, it should be  
22 charged pretty near with the same purpose it is now;  
23 the overall planning of the Metropolitan area and  
24 fringe areas around it. I don't know how far that  
25 should be. Sometimes you think we should go farther  
26 in the fringe areas now because the motorcar takes you  
27 farther away than just neighbouring municipalities, and  
28 I think that is overlooked very much, Mr. Commissioner,  
29 the role that is played by the motorcar in the municipal  
30 dilemma that we are in today.





1                   There is another phase of it too I have not  
2 touched on and perhaps I should at this present time,  
3 and that is the central core of cities have lost their  
4 magnetism because of the so-called -- what do you call  
5 it? -- amusement -- that is not the word -- that we  
6 get out of television and mass communication, and you  
7 don't need to go down to the central core to see opera  
8 or anything like that. You can see something that  
9 is called that on the idiot box. Therefore the  
10 central core of the city has not the magnetic appeal  
11 it once had, and people are not going to the central  
12 core the way they did, and that is I think one of the  
13 things that the people in the City of Toronto fail to  
14 realize. That is one of the sacred cows they will  
15 not forget. It is time that they did.

16                   I have given you a brief -- the brief on  
17 library, unfortunately it ~~was~~ left out. It was for-  
18 gotten -- and that was with regard to the Metropolitan  
19 Library Board. Here again this falls in with our  
20 philosophy that every function should be examined to  
21 see whether there is an overall general policy and that  
22 general policy we believe dictates that the Central  
23 Reference Library be under the Metropolitan Library  
24 Board. We have not said how it should be set up.  
25 That would depend a great deal upon how the municipali-  
26 ties are set up, and we also believe that cataloguing  
27 and research into library methods would be best served  
28 by the Metropolitan Board, and leave district libraries  
29 -- the district libraries are those libraries that  
30 contain a great deal of reference but not big reference



1 or nationwide references that are contained in the  
 2 Central Library, and of course neighbourhood libraries  
 3 are distinctly a local responsibility.

4 In Dr. Shaw's Report it was made quite clear  
 5 that the library services in outlying parts of the  
 6 City of Toronto were often quite inferior to those  
 7 provided in suburban areas. I think he indicated  
 8 quite definitely that cities with fifty thousand popu-  
 9 lation have better services than are the library ser-  
 10 vices generally in the Metropolitan area.

11 As for a suggestion that the Metro area  
 12 should be divided into larger units of four, five or  
 13 six boroughs, Long Branch Council is definitely against  
 14 it because that would set up competition among five  
 15 or six cities. It would make five Torontos, and I  
 16 want to say that quite definitely, because as I said  
 17 before I believe that the bloc created in the City  
 18 of Toronto has been one of the hindrances to Metro,  
 19 and that if you had four, five or six boroughs you  
 20 would have no local government at all; you would have  
 21 just six city governments competing and continually  
 22 fighting with the Metropolitan Council. Jealousy would  
 23 be setting in and there would be no progress. Not as  
 24 great progress as there would be under the set-up that  
 25 we are proposing in which the area municipalities are  
 26 small, responsible to the people, and the Metropolitan  
 27 Council which is overall planning.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You are suggesting  
 29 area municipalities of a population of about one hundred  
 30 thousand people; is that right?





1 MR. FORD: Yes.

2 THE COMMISSIONER: Does that mean that  
3 you think seventeen municipalities should be set up  
4 in this area because the population is about 1,700,000?

5 MR. FORD: I think perhaps a little more  
6 because that would allow, as I said, for expansion of  
7 those areas which are undeveloped. You wouldn't want  
8 to set up 100,000 automatically in an area that is half  
9 settled or we will say three-quarters, and find in  
10 three or four years it has already 100,000 or, say,  
11 135,000 and it should be broken into two. I think  
12 there should be at least twenty.

13

14

15

16

-

17

18

-

19

20

21

-

22

23

-

24

25

26

-

27

28

-

29

30





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Twenty municipalities?

2 MR. FORD: At least.

3 THE COMMISSIONER: And one of them would  
4 be a lakeshore municipality comprising the three  
5 lakeshore municipalities plus that part of Etobicoke  
6 lying south of the Queen Elizabeth Way?

7 MR. FORD: I can say on that that while  
8 we believe that Long Branch is run as efficiently as  
9 we can for a municipality of that size, we must say  
10 that if we had more people our staff members could  
11 specialize more along certain lines. Then we would  
12 be satisfied with just the three municipalities. But  
13 that would set up in Metro a Council which we believe  
14 would be too large, so therefore we have gone as far  
15 as the Queen Elizabeth in order to get sufficient  
16 population. That is the reason for our submission.  
17 We have stated it is a natural boundary of the Queen E.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think this area  
19 would operate more to the advantage of the people with  
20 twenty to twenty-five municipalities?

21 MR. FORD: I definitely do. I believe  
22 that the council members of the local area municipalities  
23 would have the time to go into the details that are  
24 necessary and should be necessary in order to make the  
25 decisions that are necessary to be made.

26 Today where you have, like, the City of  
27 Toronto or in the bigger municipalities -- I have had  
28 talks with other members of the Council and we truly  
29 believe that they have now overreached themselves in  
30 the common touch and are not able to get at the





1 details of the operation. We believe that when you  
2 get too large you will lose touch with the problem.  
3 You just merely take the advice of the administration  
4 and therefore the administration become the real  
5 rulers and the real government of the municipality.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: This involves splitting  
7 up the City of Toronto.

8 MR. FORD: Oh, definitely. They should  
9 be split up first.

10 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it looks to me  
11 as though you are opposed to amalgamation.

12 MR. FORD: I did not need to say that.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I believe, Mr. Ford, you  
14 said you wanted your solicitor to follow for the last  
15 part of the brief?

16 MR. FORD: Yes; that is the part on the  
17 waterfront, because we are in a problem today because  
18 of your Commission being set up just as it is now.

19 MR. N. M. SIMPSON: Mr. Commissioner, my  
20 name is Simpson. I should perhaps explain that I am  
21 appearing at the request of the Village of Long Branch  
22 in my capacity as a member of the firm which acts as  
23 their legal advisers on this particular problem.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: What are your initials?

25 MR. SIMPSON: N. M. I should perhaps  
26 also explain that I hope to be appearing tomorrow in  
27 my capacity as a member of the Council of Forest Hill  
28 on a somewhat different approach.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want the water-  
30 front moved to Forest Hill?





1 MR. SIMPSON: We could use some water-  
2 front.

3 Mr. Commissioner, the point that I would  
4 like to discuss just for a moment stems from the fact  
5 that within your Terms of Reference there is mention  
6 of the specific matters of the boundaries, of course,  
7 of the area and of the area municipalities. The  
8 Village of Long Branch at the moment is in a rather  
9 peculiar situation because we think inadvertently at  
10 the time the Village was set up and was formed as part  
11 of the larger municipality an error, I think it is  
12 fair to say, was made in the description of what was  
13 intended to be the southerly boundary of the municipi-  
14 pality. It was described as being bounded on the  
15 south by the shore of Lake Ontario.

16 The reason that this matter has come up  
17 is that the municipality was proposing to make an  
18 application to the Municipal Board some time ago for  
19 permission to annex to itself the balance of the  
20 Township of Etobicoke, which is the part that, of  
21 course, is out in the lake and which should have been  
22 the real description in the early days. By reason  
23 of the fact that your Commission was contemplated and  
24 that annexation proceedings -- this is the interpretation  
25 that has been taken -- that annexation proceedings of  
26 any kind have been frozen, shall we say, for the moment,  
27 this unfortunately has created a bit of a road block  
28 on what otherwise should have been a very simple  
29 solution to an unsatisfactory situation on the south  
30 shore of the Village.





1 I do not honestly think the freezing of  
2 the annexation proceedings was intended to stop this  
3 kind of correction of an earlier error, but in fact  
4 that has been the approach taken by the Municipal Board.

5 In an effort to get around the problem the  
6 municipality decided to apply recently for a private  
7 bill, but again at the request of the Municipal Board  
8 they have abandoned that for the moment, and it was  
9 suggested that the matter be included in the reference  
10 to you since it appeared to be something that might  
11 also affect other municipalities.

12 The description of the south boundary of  
13 the Village of Long Branch is made by reference to the  
14 south shore of the lake -- which, of course, since the  
15 time that bylaw was passed has been changing and varying  
16 and so on and strictly speaking today nobody is quite  
17 sure where the jurisdiction of the municipality is  
18 on the south shore. This has not been a problem until  
19 such time as they have started to consider zoning  
20 regulations and new developments on the lakeshore it-  
21 self. This is a fairly recent development and so it  
22 has become obvious that there is some doubt as to  
23 where exactly the jurisdiction lies in certain  
24 specific spots on the waterfront area.

25 The problem is being temporarily met by a  
26 kind of proposed partnership between the two munici-  
27 palities where for the moment they will agree. It  
28 is hoped to pass appropriate zoning bylaws which will  
29 cover the gap.

30 In other words, the Township of Etobicoke





1 it is hoped will cooperate -- and I understand at the  
2 moment that a bylaw is being drawn up by the Planning  
3 Board which will -- in other words, the Township of  
4 Etobicoke will pass a bylaw which will amend the situa-  
5 tion and the Village of Long Branch will do the same  
6 thing and between the two they will cover the area  
7 of the waterfront which is in doubt at the moment.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Has Etobicoke tried to  
9 exercise any rights there?

10 MR. SIMPSON: No. They have indicated  
11 they would be quite happy to do whatever Long Branch  
12 would like them to do. But this is really being  
13 handled at the moment under the auspices of the  
14 Chairman of the Municipal Board who is bringing the  
15 parties together and seeing that it is done in a proper  
16 way.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I would think it is  
18 yours by occupation.

19 MR. SIMPSON: This could be argued. Un-  
20 fortunately there has been quite a variation in the  
21 Ontario shoreline structure since 1929, I think, when  
22 the bylaw was originally passed and while it could  
23 with great effort be established exactly where the  
24 line is, we are a little inclined to think it may be  
25 a fair distance from the present shore line.

26 This is then the picture and the reason  
27 for the inclusion in this brief of the reference to  
28 the southerly boundary. It seems to us to be some-  
29 thing that should be brought as quickly as possible to  
30 the attention of the proper authorities, particularly





1 of course the provincial government eventually. We  
2 think we can probably cope with it in the meantime,  
3 although at the moment it is severely holding up the  
4 development of that waterfront area.

5 The problem is not a difficult one of  
6 solution because really what should have been done at  
7 the time the municipality was set up was to take that  
8 out to its proper southerly boundary which is defined  
9 in another Act as being the centre of the lake and which  
10 is referred to in the brief as (it is noted there on  
11 page 10) Section 6 of The Territorial Division Act of  
12 the 1960 Statutes, Chapter 395. In fact that is the  
13 boundary that should be the southern boundary of  
14 Long Branch, which is the centre of the lake, the line  
15 which comes between Canada and the United States.

16 Mr. Commissioner, that is really, I think,  
17 the summation of the matter.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Does it apply to any  
19 of the other municipalities?

20 MR. SIMPSON: I regret that I have not  
21 precise information on that. I am given to understand  
22 that there are some other municipalities where it is  
23 not accurate.

24 THE COMMISSIONER: The Mayor of Mimico  
25 says it does.

26 MR. GRIGGS (Mayor of Mimico): I can  
27 answer that as far as we are concerned we want to gain  
28 control over the fishing situation which has created a  
29 problem. We had a bylaw passed and established our  
30 land as 1,000 feet out in the lake. I think Long Branch





1 now thinks we should have gone further into the lake,  
2 and I think maybe we should have. When you are fixing  
3 up Long Branch, if you want to extend Mimico out to the  
4 middle of the lake it will be satisfactory to us. That  
5 was done some time ago.

6 MR. SIMPSON: I might say just to clarify  
7 perhaps one other point that might be of interest that  
8 one of the other reasons that this has been deferred  
9 and has created a bit of a build-up of pressure on  
10 the waterfront is that there was a technical committee  
11 which was considering the whole waterfront development  
12 and at the request of the municipality here Long Branch  
13 again held this pressure in abeyance until that  
14 committee had looked at the matter.

15 It has now become clear that nothing that  
16 the Village of Long Branch has in mind appears to be  
17 in any way opposed or out of line with the recommen-  
18 dations of that technical committee, so there seems  
19 to be no further reason for a delay in proceeding with  
20 the development of their waterfront area.

21 But we do suggest that this matter be con-  
22 sidered by the Commissioner with the thought that it be  
23 clarified at the time that any changes are made in the  
24 Metropolitan boundary areas.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I see in the brief you  
26 say that early in 1963 the Council of Long Branch made  
27 application to the Municipal Board for approval of a  
28 revision of the southerly boundary of the village by  
29 extending it to a new line approximately 1,000 feet.  
30 This is apparently what Mimico did -- 1,000 feet.





1 MR. SIMPSON: Yes. May I explain that  
2 subsequently it was discovered that that was not . . .  
3 that would have solved the problem -- let me put it  
4 that way -- but further examination of the matter  
5 indicated a thousand feet was just picking a survey  
6 line rather than taking what in fact was the proper  
7 line, because your 1,000 feet legally would still have  
8 left the balance of the waterfront area, or the land  
9 under the water, temporarily under the administration  
10 of the area municipality which seemed to be rather  
11 pointless.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: If you got a thousand  
13 feet could you not rent the balance to Etobicoke?

14 MR. SIMPSON: Gladly. I think a  
15 thousand feet has been pointed up as the practical  
16 solution. However, the application was withdrawn at  
17 the request of the Board.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: I will look into that  
19 and make sure it does not have to be referred to the  
20 United Nations.

21 We will now adjourn until tomorrow morning  
22 at ten o'clock when Etobicoke will present its brief.

23 ---Whereupon the hearing was adjourned until  
24 Wednesday the 23rd day of April, at 10.00 a.m.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30



# ROYAL COMMISSION

ON

## METROPOLITAN TORONTO

HEARINGS

Held at

PARLIAMENT BLDGS.  
TORONTO

VOLUME No. \_\_\_\_\_ DATE:

3. \_\_\_\_\_ APRIL 23, 1964.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS

ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO., LTD.  
BOARD OF TRADE BLDG.  
11 ADELAIDE ST. W.  
TORONTO

364-5865 364-7383





ROYAL COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Hearings of the Royal Commission  
on Metropolitan Toronto, held at  
the Parliament Buildings, Toronto,  
Ontario, on Thursday, April 23rd,  
1964, commencing at 10:00 a.m.,  
et seq.

COMMISSION:

H. Carl Goldenberg, O.B.E., Q.C.	Commissioner
F. H. Finnis	Secretary
L. Feldman	Research Officer
T. Plunkett	Municipal Consultant

\* \* \* \* \*





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

INDEX TO SUBMISSIONS

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE	218 - 256
TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK	257 - 289
THE TOWN OF LEASIDE	290 - 318
THE CORPORATION OF THE VILLAGE OF FOREST HILL	319 - 349

\* \* \* \* \*





SUBMISSION BY

THE TOWNSHIP OF ETOBICOKE

Appearances:

Mr. John T. MacBeth Mayor

Mr. Donald R. Steele, Q.C.

MR. MacBETH: Good morning, Mr. Commissioner. Are you ready to proceed?

THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. As you know, Mr. MacBeth, I have read your brief and have analysed it and it won't be necessary for you to re-read it. Feel free to read from it as you wish or summarize it.

MR. MacBETH: Mr. Commissioner, it is my privilege to open the presentation of the Township of Etobicoke. My remarks will be relatively brief and not that much in fact. Mr. Steele, our solicitor, is at my right hand side and he will be making the main body of the presentation.

We are here this morning as one of the oldest municipalities of the County of York, having joined the county in 1850, at the same time as Scarborough and York Township.

With us this morning are a good number of our staff. They are efficient, capable, and a loyal staff. I wanted to mention that because it seems to me, Mr. Commissioner, that in the last two days and in the days to come you will be hearing a great deal from the politicians. Sometimes we politicians





1           perhaps give ourselves more credit for running  
2     the show than we deserve.     I would think that perhaps  
3     in the function of government that the politicians form  
4     less than two or three per cent and that the everyday  
5     permanent staff are the ones that really make it work.

6           There is just one thought I have in this  
7     regard.     It is perhaps the esprit de corps, the  
8     loyalty, and the efficiency of the staff that depend  
9     on whether our government works or does not.     It does  
10    not depend so much on the noise that the politicians  
11    make.     I think the most inefficient part of a factory  
12    is its noise.     The politicians supply the noise in  
13    the factory of government.

14           I think perhaps you might in your delibera-  
15    tions give some thought to the personnel and whether  
16    the personnel and their esprit de corps is best off  
17    under a large system of government or the staff  
18    perhaps becomes known as a number, as it does in  
19    Metropolitan Toronto, or whether the best, efficient,  
20    and most courteous form of government is one where  
21    the staff is happy in its work.

22           It can be argued both ways.     I suggest to  
23    you perhaps that spirit will be best where there is some  
24    compactness and some degree of limitation to its size.

25           Etotobicoke comes before you as a municipality  
26    that is relatively satisfied with the manner in which  
27    Metropolitan Toronto government has functioned.     We  
28    have no serious problem areas within the municipality,  
29    either financially or in an administrative sense.  
30    We come before you with no territorial ambitions, Mr.





1 Commissioner.

2 We believe there is one serious element  
3 confronting Metropolitan Toronto, certainly confronting  
4 it as far as Etobicoke is concerned. That is the  
5 subject you have here about representation by popula-  
6 tion. We claim we pay in Etobicoke 12 per cent of  
7 the piper's fees and call less than 4 per cent of the  
8 tunes. We feel that the citizenry of Etobicoke  
9 are sound, stable, and a progressive element of the  
10 metropolitan community but have a restricted vote.

11 I think it is true that many of the people  
12 who live in the suburban municipalities are ones that  
13 have moved out of the City of Toronto, such as myself.  
14 I know many of my fellow people from Etobicoke were  
15 born and brought up in Toronto and moved to the  
16 suburbs. These are the people who have a sincere  
17 interest. It is our heritage by reason of birth  
18 as well as adoption.

19 In the next few days, and already perhaps,  
20 you will become plagued with facts and figures. I  
21 will ask you to ponder a few questions I present to  
22 you.

23 First of all, is the American mesmerism  
24 of size a virtue? Is the small man not as capable  
25 as the big man and for that matter less likely to go  
26 to pot?

27 Is the large vehicle more economical than  
28 the little one?

29 Does the housewife on a \$5,000 budget  
30 not get more basic value than one on a \$25,000 budget?





1 I think if you will look at the mill rate  
2 in the Metropolitan area you will find that the smaller  
3 the municipality the lower the mill rate. I know  
4 there are many reasons why but I think that the fact  
5 that the mill rates are almost in direct proportion  
6 to the size of the municipality has something to do  
7 with the matter of efficiency.

8 I would also ask you is uniformity a  
9 blessing or a curse? Is there no room for individuality?  
10 Must all two million, as we will soon be, in Metro be  
11 subject to the same curriculum, the same recreational  
12 programme, the same cold charitable benefits?

13 I believe there is room for some differ-  
14 ences of opinion throughout the entire Metro area. I  
15 ask is Toronto's 40 per cent higher mill rate than that  
16 of the Township of Etobicoke because it is less  
17 efficient or because it gives better service?

18 Now when I say 40 per cent higher, as you  
19 know, Mr. Commissioner, we each share a common Metro  
20 levy so where Etobicoke's local mill rate has been  
21 some 25 mills for local education and municipal ser-  
22 vices the city's has been closer to 35. I have  
23 taken 10 over 25.

24 Is the fact they are 40 per cent higher  
25 because they give better service or because they are  
26 more efficient? If the answer to either question is  
27 "Yes" then I think amalgamation would be an obvious  
28 injustice. If they give 40 per cent more service why  
29 should we be saddled with the same mill rate over a  
30 common assessment area? If they are 40 per cent





1 less efficient I think the answer is likewise obvious.

2 Sometimes I wonder whether the size of the  
3 municipality produces a different breed of politician?  
4 Coming from a middle-size community I can say that.  
5 I like to think of the municipality as being governed  
6 by businessmen who have businesses to run and who  
7 are in the public field because of a sense of public  
8 duty.

9 Now, I ask whether the size of the municipi-  
10 pality does produce a different breed of politicians,  
11 perhaps even a more desirable one. Those are open  
12 questions.

13 Another question I would ask you is if  
14 you line up twelve men on each side, as we have done  
15 at Metro Council, and sit a referee in the middle, are  
16 you not asking for a contest rather than for a  
17 business of government?

18 Sometimes likewise I feel those of us who  
19 are down on our luck tend to blame everyone else but  
20 ourselves. If our mill rate is higher we point to  
21 circumstance s rather than perhaps our own mismanagement  
22 or lack of judgment.

23 Now, sir, this ends my few comments. I  
24 have asked you the questions. Metro Toronto is  
25 looking to you as a Solomon. We expect you to come  
26 up with the answers to many of these questions and  
27 many more. So I will not leave you entirely in  
28 the wilderness as far as Etobicoke is concerned; I  
29 will ask Donald R. Steele, Esq., Q.C., who is the  
30 illustrious son of an illustrious father, to speak to





1 you. I mention that since the firm he represents  
2 has been serving Etobicoke since 1890. This is some  
3 of the loyalty and respect that we have and the con-  
4 tinuity that we have. Mr. Steele's father was  
5 solicitor for the Township and a smaller firm prior  
6 to that since about the year 1890.

7 With these words I will ask Mr. Steele to  
8 give you the real meat of our brief. Thank you, Mr.  
9 Commissioner.

10 MR. STEELE: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.  
11 I hope you will not feel I am tied down with antiquity  
12 after the comments made here.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I didn't gather you  
14 were solicitor for Etobicoke in 1890.

15 MR. STEELE: I don't think even my father  
16 was thought of in those days.

17 I am afraid that some of the things I might  
18 have otherwise said have been said by the reeve, and  
19 perhaps much better. I think the main points in the  
20 Etobicoke brief areas follows:

21 (1) A strong belief in local government.  
22 In this connection of local government I would like  
23 to refer to you a quotation from the Second Interim  
24 Report of Select Committee on The Municipal Act and  
25 Related Acts. It is on page 3:

26 "The Committee has not presupposed the  
27 sanctity of local self-government, but  
28 has come logically to the conclusion  
29 that it must be preserved in order to  
30 protect, nurture and further develop





1 to maturity our inherent belief in  
2 political freedom and personal liberty.  
3 This fundamental philosophy can very  
4 easily be overlooked in the scramble  
5 for efficiency and expediency if too  
6 little emphasis is placed on the means  
7 of accomplishing a specific result.

8 "In order to preserve local autonomy,  
9 it is imperative that local governments  
10 have complete jurisdiction and control over  
11 matters of purely local nature, including  
12 the means of raising revenue to finance  
13 the undertakings."

14 That was said about local government in  
15 the entire province, not the Metro area in particular.  
16 I would point out to you that it is equally applicable  
17 to the Metro form of government.

18 Now secondly, as Reeve MacBeth has said,  
19 this Township does not come here with any ideas of  
20 land grabbing or giving land away either. The  
21 Township considers that its obligation to this Com-  
22 mission is to present its opinions on government in  
23 the Metro Toronto area and to assist in any way pos-  
24 sible. However, we do recognize, as Reeve MacBeth  
25 said, that there will have to be some reorganization  
26 and changes to achieve the question of representation  
27 and other matters. To this extent we are willing to  
28 give and take. I might say we are willing to give  
29 to the extent of giving away lands at present or  
30 taking lands, whichever should work out.





1 Government should be to serve the people  
2 in the best manner possible and this should not be  
3 marred by present boundaries or present vested local  
4 interests.

5 Now Etobicoke does not believe that the  
6 Metropolitan form of government is basically new as a  
7 structure. The powers contained within that structure  
8 may have been new, but they see a metropolitan form  
9 of government as being similar to the county structure  
10 of government. This is a structure whereby there  
11 is a central government for the overall problems and  
12 there is a smaller local unit for the more local areas.  
13 This county system is well known throughout the whole  
14 province of Ontario and it has been in existence for  
15 years.

16  
17  
18 -

19  
20  
21  
22 -

23  
24  
25  
26 -

27  
28  
29 -  
30





1 Now, fourthly, Etobicoke is extremely  
2 strongly opposed to amalgamation because they believe,  
3 not that amalgamation as such is bad in that sense, but  
4 they believe that effective local government would  
5 cease under amalgamation. I will come back to this  
6 point later.

7 Fifthly we have pointed out certain sug-  
8 gestions for changes and modifications in the existing  
9 authority of the present Metropolitan government but  
10 within its structure.

11 Now, as Reeve MacBeth has said the biggest  
12 difficulty is the question of representation. We are  
13 opposed to a multiple voting system and we believe  
14 that the members of the Metropolitan Council should  
15 also be members of a local council to provide proper  
16 liaison between the two bodies. As a result of this,  
17 it appears that it may be necessary to alter the  
18 boundaries to give proper representation; bearing in  
19 mind that the responsibility of the major overall  
20 problems is vested in the Metropolitan government  
21 which I would like to refer to simply as Metro -- it  
22 will save time and effort -- we believe that there is  
23 an ultimate size of a municipality in Metro.

24 Some existing municipalities may be too  
25 small, while others may be too big. We have some  
26 disagreement even within Etobicoke as to what this  
27 exact ultimate size should be. Some figures are as  
28 low as 100,000 or 150,000, but I am authorized to say  
29 we are unanimous that the total figure should  
30 should not be over 300,000 people for efficient local



1 government.

2 In this connection, you no doubt have  
3 knowledge of the studies made in such cities as London,  
4 England. I believe some of these things were already  
5 quoted in the Scarborough brief and I will not repeat  
6 them to you. I would like to point out to you a  
7 quotation from Mr. David R. McGuire, Jr., who was the  
8 Chief Administrative Officer of New Orleans. This  
9 was in the November 1956 issue of Municipal Finance,  
10 which is a little while ago but I think the words he  
11 uses are very apt.

12 It says: "After the central city --" he  
13 is speaking of New Orleans and general local government  
14 in the United States. He says: "After the central  
15 city reaches a certain size perhaps 600,000 or  
16 700,000 people, perhaps larger, I believe that there  
17 is a law of diminishing returns under which centralized  
18 and municipal management, which is the direction in  
19 which our moderate and larger cities have been heading,  
20 can be obtained. I think there is a point of diminish-  
21 ing returns where central management functions less  
22 effectively. I see no limit to urban or metropolitan  
23 growth, but I suggest that there is a limit to the size  
24 of area that can be effectively and economically ad-  
25 ministered. The bigger the municipal area and its  
26 government, the more cumbersome will be that govern-  
27 ment, and the less personal it will be. There will  
28 be less contact and rapport between the government  
29 and the people."

30 Now, in his quotation, he refers to an





1 ultimate size of six or seven hundred thousand people.  
2 We believe that figure is wrong but the principle is  
3 the same, that there is a limit at which you cease to  
4 get -- start to get diminishing returns from your  
5 government.

6 In considering what the boundaries of a  
7 municipality should be within the Metropolitan area,  
8 we believe that assessment and geography should also  
9 be a factor because while we believe in representation  
10 by population we recognize there have to be some  
11 variations because of geography and local conditions  
12 and assessments.

13 Having said all this, it is obvious while  
14 we agree in principle with Mr. Allen's comment made  
15 on the first day of the hearing on a redivision of  
16 the Metropolitan area, on the question of population  
17 alone, we have to disagree with him. We believe that  
18 there should be more than just six municipalities.  
19 We believe that there should be somewhere -- consider-  
20 ing all of these factors -- possibly between seven  
21 and ten. We have not tried to draw the boundaries  
22 of them because we believe you will have before you  
23 far more information than we and also we do not feel  
24 competent to reorganize or chop up our neighbours.  
25 We do believe that if a realignment of the boundaries  
26 of larger municipalities is required, it should not  
27 be shied away from any more than the merging of smaller  
28 municipalities. The fact that a municipality is at  
29 present very large, should not make it inviolate  
30 but should really be a reason for seriously looking at





1 it to see in the light of present Metropolitan services.

2 Perhaps I should point out at one time  
3 because of trunk sewers or other matters of that sort  
4 it was necessary for certain areas to be annexed or  
5 amalgamated into one when as these major services now  
6 come under the Metropolitan government, we do not  
7 believe that there is necessarily the same reason  
8 for holding some of these larger municipalities  
9 together. There may have been before the Metropolitan  
10 system.

11 Often you will find that existing municipal  
12 boundaries really cut through local community interests  
13 and in many realignments could be made from one  
14 municipality to another even if it meant separating  
15 this one from the larger municipality.

16 Now, we should also never forget the  
17 extremely large population of the Metropolitan area  
18 and its anticipated growth, as well as the already  
19 increasing urbanization of the surrounding municipali-  
20 ties immediately outside the existing Metropolitan  
21 area. If you were to adopt the principle that all  
22 urbanization abutting areas are to be within one city,  
23 then the existing Metropolitan area would become one  
24 City of Toronto, and at the present time would be the  
25 largest single municipal government in Canada. This  
26 would only be a stepping stone further along the road  
27 to possibly twenty years from now when this one  
28 single largest city should ultimately be merged with  
29 possibly the City of Hamilton and everything in be-  
30 tween because they will possibly all be abutting urban





1 developments.

2 This is obviously, I would suggest, unde-  
3 sirable if you believe at all in local government.  
4 Short of arbitrarily halting all expansion in the existing  
5 Metropolitan area and just saying we will have a green  
6 belt around it and stop development, I suggest that the  
7 solution is to provide a Metropolitan system of  
8 government that is flexible enough, and I might say,  
9 attractive enough to encourage these other urban  
10 areas to ultimately join in with the overall Metro-  
11 politan form of government. Whether there should be  
12 one metropolitan form of government in the Hamilton  
13 area and another one in the Toronto area, I do not  
14 go into that. I don't know. This is before your  
15 Commission.

16 I think it should be obvious that unless  
17 you are going to create a mammoth situation that  
18 should be an attractive form of Metropolitan government  
19 so the other surrounding municipalities, not only  
20 logically should join, but will all be willing to  
21 join the Metropolitan form.

22 Now, we believe that an essential element  
23 of democratic local government is the right of the  
24 individual to be heard and that government should be  
25 quick and efficient. Now, the same reason applying  
26 to government as applies to the courts -- justice  
27 delayed is justice not done. In the courts, there  
28 are the Supreme Court but there are also the Division  
29 Courts for speedy and personal consideration of claims  
30 and problems. On the same basis, we believe that





1 local government should, wherever possible, be kept  
2 on a basis as close to the people as possible so that  
3 local matters may receive speedy and personal considera-  
4 tion.

5 Even with the present volume of work of the  
6 existing Metropolitan Council, it is impossible for an  
7 individual to be heard by Council. He must appear  
8 before a committee only. Most area municipalities  
9 hear their ratepayers before the full council either  
10 directly or in many cases on appeal from a committee.  
11 I might say the committee usually screen out most of  
12 the problems but there is still the right of the  
13 ratepayer to come before the full council to be heard.  
14 This would be impossible in a one-city basis and it  
15 would be hard to explain to people why they can only  
16 present their case to a committee that might not  
17 include one of their own elected representatives,  
18 because if you get a large city you are going to have  
19 many committees and you are going to have only a  
20 certain number of people that can sit on each one.  
21 These are petty, little things which in the overall  
22 are petty, but to the person are extremely important.  
23 It might be a case of where a sidewalk is going to be  
24 on their front lawn when it is built or their neighbour  
25 is taking in some roomers and they want to change the  
26 zoning bylaws or something of this nature or what  
27 parking regulations there might be on their streets.  
28 A multitude of minor matters which can only be handled  
29 as long as there is a sounding place for people to go  
30 and say: "You are the people we elected. We want you





1 to do this for us." Whether they get the answer or  
2 not really is not as important as the fact that they  
3 had their chance to go and say so, whereas if you are  
4 in a larger unit you may be appearing before a group  
5 you didn't elect at all, when the decision will be  
6 made by the overall elected body; they would be almost  
7 a rubber stamp because you wouldn't get a fresh dele-  
8 gation before them. There would be a rubber stamp  
9 report that came from their committee.

10 Considering the volume of work and the  
11 amount of these local things, I think we should recog-  
12 nize the services that our elected councillor gives  
13 to his constituents. While I am sure most complaints  
14 of ratepayers that go to Council are quite justified,  
15 there are a good many that result from misunderstandings,  
16 through possible arbitrary actions of administrative  
17 officers or through pure mistakes. Now, in a true  
18 local government with an elected representative, those  
19 elected representatives play a very important part in  
20 ratepayers being able to call them and say: "I have a  
21 complaint" and that elected representative can then  
22 go and investigate it and I would guess that there  
23 are a great many cases, in fact, possibly the majority  
24 of cases that never do come to Council or a committee  
25 for any actual administrative action because the matter  
26 has been clarified and straightened out, by that  
27 councillor being an elected representative and going  
28 to the proper people and saying: "What is the problem  
29 here?" and getting the true story and explaining it  
30 to his constituent. The larger the municipal unit and



1 the larger the number of ratepayers that any elected  
2 representative must represent, the more likely the  
3 chance that this close chain of communication will  
4 break down.

5 Speaking of elected representatives, I  
6 think we should remember that people should be en-  
7 couraged to participate in the government itself by  
8 seeking elective office. I would say it is extremely  
9 time consuming and also very costly to become elected  
10 the head of any of the existing large municipalities  
11 within the Metropolitan area or for that matter to be  
12 elected comptroller of any of them on an overall vote.

13 For instance, the City of Toronto has about  
14 six hundred thousand or more population and approxi-  
15 mately 14 per cent of the total area within Metropoli-  
16 tan Toronto. Can you visualize the time involved  
17 and the cost involved in becoming elected mayor or  
18 controller of one city including the whole Metropolitan  
19 area with approximately two million people and 241  
20 square miles?

21 There is no federal or provincial politician  
22 who has ever had to face the magnitude of this problem,  
23 even with a political party behind him. We sincerely  
24 hope political parties will not be part of the local  
25 government system.

26 We can only see in any one-city basis, with  
27 this electing power, it is handing more money and certainly  
28 more power to the press, TV and radio because these are  
29 the channels of communication that the public itself  
30 gets the image from of the politician. Speaking of





1 the press, perhaps being efficient, it might be there  
2 are ways of amalgamating the three City of Toronto  
3 newspapers, which may be much more efficient than  
4 having three separate ones, but there might not be  
5 three separate views expressed.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: That is one of the  
7 few items not included in my Terms of Reference.

8 MR. STEELE: I think we should remember  
9 that many of these problems and policies that are  
10 faced by municipal governments are different in a  
11 different fashion in the various parts of the Metro  
12 area. These problems are different in the new  
13 suburban areas than in the older built-up areas, for  
14 instance: plans of subdivision in a new area the  
15 developer in effect is asked to pay for all these  
16 services that go on or a majority of them and in the  
17 older areas the municipality is seeking and looking  
18 for redevelopment and for that reason any new services  
19 that are required are put in by the municipality it-  
20 self or on a local improvement basis.

21 I think that this problem is recognized  
22 by Metro at the present time. For instance, in the  
23 newer area, or the suburban area, if a subdivision of  
24 land is created for either single family or multiple  
25 housing and it creates a bigger load on the sewage  
26 disposal system, Metro has imposed a levy for sewage  
27 disposal. In the City of Toronto and in some of  
28 the other more built-up area municipalities, if a  
29 greater load is placed on the sewage disposal  
30 facilities by way of a new apartment house or a





1 redevelopment of some sort, there is no levy.

2 We are not arguing the merits of whether  
3 or not you should or should not have a levy. We are  
4 merely pointing out these things that there are dif-  
5 ferent problems and different solutions to those  
6 problems in differing areas within Metro itself.

7 We believe that the reorientation of the  
8 existing municipalities and the creation of more equal  
9 representation will put an end to what are probably  
10 Metro Toronto's greatest weaknesses. We believe  
11 these weaknesses are the equal representation between  
12 the city and the suburbs, which, as Reeve MacBeth  
13 stated, creates basically two opposing teams, the  
14 Toronto team and the suburban team or party.

15 Even if there are deserters from time to  
16 time on both sides, these deserters gradually become  
17 independent Torontonians or independent suburbanites.  
18 Everybody knows that their ranks will not stay that  
19 way for very long. There is nothing wrong with people  
20 of a common interest voting together but when you have  
21 one-half of the members of any interest voting to-  
22 gether and the other half of the members elected from  
23 various municipalities, rather than one municipality,  
24 it is like saying there is a strong government party  
25 and a divided opposition.

26 This is not Metro government but partisan  
27 politics and partisan government and there is no reason  
28 for us to believe that much of the voting has not been  
29 done primarily for purposes of fostering the idea of an  
30 amalgamated government some day.





1 We believe that a strong Metro form of  
2 government will do away with this constant harassment  
3 of a basically good system of government by many  
4 people in the City of Toronto and the usual one-sided  
5 coverage by the City of Toronto press.

6 Turning to the various functions -- those  
7 are all my overall general comments -- turning to the  
8 various functions of Metro and of the local area  
9 municipalities, we believe that most of these functions  
10 have worked out very well. A few have been trouble-  
11 some and we believe that these troublesome ones should  
12 be reviewed in the light of the suggested change in  
13 the size of area municipalities.

14 Actually some of the changes we might  
15 suggest we would admit may not be applicable if you  
16 have extremely small municipalities as well as medium  
17 sized municipalities. Theoretically we submit there  
18 should be a size of not more than 300,000, then we  
19 feel there is validity in the comment we are going to  
20 make about the suggested changes.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: What would be the  
22 minimum population?

23 MR. STEELE: We have not come out with an  
24 exact figure on that, Mr. Commissioner. I don't know  
25 whether Reeve MacBeth would like to make a comment on  
26 that. I would say in discussions -- I don't believe  
27 anyone in Etobicoke came out with a figure of less  
28 than 150,000 but I don't believe they said it should  
29 not be less than 150,000. I think that they said  
30 you have to look at the assessment rather than pick a





1 number.

2 I think the theory on a minimum side of  
3 population is the minimum assessment area so that  
4 the municipality can afford to hire the best calibre of  
5 personnel to administer itself. It really comes down  
6 to the ability to pay, shall we say?

7 Some very small municipalities may have  
8 an extremely high assessment and therefore may be left  
9 with one square mile or a very small area. Other  
10 municipalities because of lower assessment may have  
11 to be a larger unit.

12 We are not trying to come out and say we  
13 think the ultimate is 50,000 or 100,000 or 150,000.  
14 Frankly, we don't know because there are so many  
15 different factors come into it.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: You do say the four or  
17 five or six municipalities would not be enough?

18 MR. STEELE: We don't believe so but we  
19 believe the reason we say that is on the question of  
20 local representations. We feel if you had six you  
21 would have speaking roughly 280,000 to 300,000 people  
22 now and with the anticipated growth in the balance of  
23 the Metropolitan area, very soon these figures would  
24 be well over the 300,000 figure. We feel at that  
25 level you are losing the prime essence of local govern-  
26 ment.

27

28

29

30





1 I would like to speak objectively of the  
2 function of the metropolitan government only and not  
3 subjectively of the actual decisions that have been made  
4 within the functions because we have disagreed strongly  
5 with the Metropolitan Corporation on some of its  
6 decisions. This does not necessarily mean that we  
7 believe that matters like transportation or low-rent  
8 housing are not proper Metro functions. While we may  
9 have had some disagreements with them over their  
10 decisions we still feel they are proper functions. We  
11 do feel that there are some fields that Metro now  
12 controls that it should not and there are some that it  
13 does not that it should. But I would like to deal with  
14 only a few of those items as our brief primarily sets  
15 out our views on most of them.

16 The first item I would like to refer to is  
17 the question of police. We believe that the policing of  
18 the laws of the appropriate government is an integral  
19 part of the democratic system and for efficient police  
20 control there should be a community feeling that the  
21 police are part of the community rather than something  
22 foreign that has to be called upon in emergencies only.

23 We supported the creation of a Metro police  
24 force but we are somewhat disappointed in its results.  
25 First, the cost has gone up considerably and secondly -  
26 and perhaps far more important than the cost factor,  
27 because there are some intangibles which go into cost  
28 factors - we believe the feeling of co-operation between  
29 the people and the police has diminished.

30 We believe that for efficient policing the





1 local constable should know the people in his area and  
2 be thoroughly familiar with them and the area.

3 There are different police problems in  
4 different parts of Metropolitan Toronto and therefore  
5 different methods of policing need be employed. I am  
6 thinking of some areas where you always have to have two  
7 policemen going together in an area whereas in other  
8 areas you probably do not need a man on the beat at all;  
9 a cruiser driving around is quite sufficient.

10 With one force and a policy of switching  
11 personnel from one district to another it must be dif-  
12 ficult for the police themselves to become familiar with  
13 the local areas they are policing. From our point of  
14 view, while we have been fortunate in the calibre and  
15 ability of the men who have been posted to our munici-  
16 pality - and I think perhaps I should stress that word  
17 "posted". It is like a posting. You are told: "You  
18 go there", rather than the feeling that you are part of  
19 a community. While each of them has offered great  
20 personal assistance, these men hardly have become  
21 familiarized with the area and the local by-laws and  
22 conditions before they are transferred some place else.

23 We should remember that the police must  
24 enforce the area by-laws and are charged under The  
25 Metropolitan Act so to do - the area by-laws as well as  
26 the traffic by-laws, as well as the Criminal Code and  
27 the Metro by-laws, and that these area by-laws vary  
28 greatly. They do vary from one municipality to another  
29 and the enforcement of them has not always been entirely  
30 satisfactory.





1                   We believe there should be a local force  
2 responsible to the local council or a local police  
3 commission to deal with local matters and by-laws and  
4 the inspection of and protection of local property.  
5 We believe there should be a Metropolitan force for  
6 criminal investigations, communications, Metropolitan  
7 traffic arteries and the enforcement of Metropolitan by-  
8 laws.

9                   When I say a local force, there could be  
10 two methods of going about this local force. One could  
11 be an entirely separate force for these local matters  
12 hired and fired by the local police commission, shall we  
13 say, or there could be a subdivision of the existing  
14 Metropolitan force to give much more local control,  
15 whether it be to a local police commission in the area  
16 municipalities, but with a responsibility and a more  
17 direct local control of some of these matters. I will  
18 admit that in the second there would be some overlapping  
19 of jurisdiction. It might not be the most efficient.

20                  Turning next to licensing, we believe that  
21 all licences that operate from a stationary location  
22 should be licensed locally and that other more mobile  
23 businesses should be licensed by Metro.

24                  We believe it was wrong to put all of  
25 this jurisdiction in Metro in the first place, even  
26 though there may have been reasons for that, such as  
27 the smallness of some area municipalities and the need  
28 for extra volume of work for the Metro Licensing Commis-  
29 sion. With the proposed reorganization in the size of  
30 the municipalities, however, we believe that these truly





1 local matters should be returned to local licencing  
2 where they may receive more personal attention.

3 Most of these small local items are of no  
4 major overall concern, but may be extremely disturbing  
5 to a locality. Probably the greatest difficulty is the  
6 matter of understanding and liaison between the Commission  
7 and the detailed problems of any applicant and the  
8 problems of the local municipality.

9 I am getting a little ahead of myself. I  
10 think I should say that the Metro Licensing Commission  
11 is simply too far removed from the scene. If a problem  
12 arises it may take months before - it is not a question  
13 of that particular licence, but it may take months  
14 before the problem that has been created by it is  
15 resolved, possibly through an amendment to the by-law.  
16 If these small local matters were administered by the  
17 local municipality then many by-laws could be changed  
18 within a matter of days. That one may have got away,  
19 but you make sure they won't hang around, sort of idea.

20 At the present time in the Metro area  
21 Metro takes the licence applications and issues the  
22 licences but ask the local municipality to do all its  
23 investigations concerning local zoning, building  
24 violations, health and other local by-laws that might  
25 apply. But it does not always act on the recommendations  
26 of the local municipalities. They ask them to do all  
27 the leg work, as it were, in checking them out. We are  
28 not complaining about the staff of the Licensing Commis-  
29 sion, but the function itself. I think this shows the  
30 close liaison between local licensing and local by-laws





1 because in most cases it is the local by-law that really  
2 governs whether a licence will or will not be granted.  
3 Metro refers this to the local area and gets the report  
4 and it does not necessarily follow the recommendations.

5 Metro itself recognizes the difference in  
6 licensing by dividing the work between their head office  
7 licences and their area office licences. We would recom-  
8 mend as a general rule of thumb that all area office  
9 licences be transferred to the local authority rather  
10 than the Metropolitan authority and in a few cases  
11 set out in our brief we have suggested that some of the  
12 licences issued by the head office of the Metropolitan  
13 Licensing Commission not be issued without local approval  
14 because they have created some difficulties in the  
15 past. But I do not think I need to plague you with  
16 the details of that.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you not be  
18 creating new political administrative difficulties by  
19 imposing that requirement?

20 MR. STEELE: In asking Metro to make  
21 sure they clear with the local municipality in two or  
22 three items?

23 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. You say in your  
24 brief that licences for certain of the operations should  
25 not be issued without the prior approval by the local  
26 municipality.

27 MR. STEELE: Yes, we would be, but perhaps  
28 we had better say with consultation with the local  
29 municipality rather than "prior approval", although we  
30 would like to see approval because we have had a great deal





1 of difficulty with refreshment vehicles and certain other  
2 what they call "culleltors" who go around; they are  
3 scavengers in a sense. Metro licenses them and author-  
4 izes them to go out and go through garbage cans, as it  
5 were, to pick out anything that might be salvagable. The  
6 local by-laws under the health and sanitation by-laws  
7 prohibit anyone touching a garbage can. There is a  
8 complete overlapping on this thing. We feel certainly  
9 in some municipalities culletting licences should not be  
10 issued at all.

11 I could go into details on a lot of these  
12 things, but I admit there would be a problem with our  
13 refreshment vehicles. Etobicoke has a by-law which in  
14 effect prohibits refreshment vehicles in practically the  
15 whole Township with a few small designated areas excepted  
16 and yet Metro will issue a licence to a person for a  
17 refreshment vehicle that is good all over the Metro area.  
18 Those are the detailed problems.

19 With respect to the question of the sub-office  
20 or the local area office of Metro Commission being trans-  
21 ferred, I do not think that is creating any difficulty at  
22 all. It will merely be part of the local staff. They  
23 will administer it and work in much closer liaison with  
24 the building authorities, the zoning authorities and the  
25 health authorities than is at present possible through  
26 the Metro Licensing and sub-licensing. Most of these  
27 are infinitesimal in the overall picture but they can  
28 create a great deal of difficulty in local areas.

29 I am thinking of a problem Etobicoke has  
30 been having with service station and public garage





1 licences. I am sure this will all work out but it is  
2 very cumbersome and detailed to convince the Metro  
3 licensing authority, and these were only taking about  
4 whether there be a public garage licence or service  
5 station licence issued in a form that conforms to our  
6 zoning by-law. It could be worked out, but it is  
7 cumbersome.

8 Also in New Toronto there was a billiard  
9 hall licence issued on which I think there were two or  
10 three deputations to the Metro Licensing Commission and  
11 a great issue on it. The Metro Commission issued the  
12 licence. The people of New Toronto and area, I think  
13 they had a petition of something like four or five  
14 thousand people against the thing.

15 But these are issues that are of great  
16 importance locally but really do not mean a thing on  
17 the overall. That is why we are advocating they should  
18 go back to local authorities.

19 I have already left with your Secretary a  
20 division of the list of the Metro licences showing how  
21 they themselves break it down into the two categories.  
22 I think <sup>it</sup> really boils down to the more or less Metro-wide  
23 mobile type operation at head office. We say that  
24 should continue. The stationary smaller licences  
25 should go to the local municipality.

26 THE COMMISSIONER: The Metro Licensing  
27 Commission keeps the fees, does it?

28 MR. STEELE: Yes, they keep the fees.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: Does that in any way  
30 influence your view?





1 MR. STEELE: Not particularly. Frankly  
2 in our past experience from licensing before Metro took  
3 over the revenue <sup>from</sup>/licensing, let us say, was not much of  
4 a profit. It is more of a service we are providing.  
5 I do not think we have ever made a profit on it. I am  
6 looking at the Treasurer. He is shaking his head. It  
7 is a service more than anything.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: Would your suggestion  
9 lead to different fees for the same licence in the  
10 different municipalities?

11 MR. STEELE: I think within the framework  
12 of the resolution and court decisions - there are  
13 certain court decisions that say you cannot go further  
14 than certain fees - I would say Yes, on the minor  
15 ones it could lead to that.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Would you think that  
17 would be desirable?

18 MR. STEELE: On the question of fees you  
19 cannot say that is a fee because we are not taking a  
20 licence fee as a tax. We are really taking it to try  
21 and cover the cost of the service. If one local munici-  
22 pality wanted to require much stricter, say, sanitary or  
23 health supervision or something of this nature on a  
24 particular unit that was more costly than some other  
25 municipality might by choice do, I think it is only  
26 obvious that the fee in that municipality should be  
27 different from that in the other.

28 With respect to the question of welfare, we  
29 are basically satisfied with the present set-up of the  
30 Metropolitan system of welfare where most of it is left





1 with the local municipality. There is some function  
2 administered by the Metropolitan Corporation but I think  
3 my only comments here would be in a negative sense  
4 really against centralization of all the welfare services  
5 either in Metro or in one city, shall we say.

6 There has been some talk in the past over  
7 some of these functions being taken over by Metro  
8 Toronto. We feel that would be a distinct mistake.  
9 First of all, many of the permissive services such as  
10 day nurseries are only provided by the City of Toronto.  
11 If there was a centralization there would be an immediate  
12 demand for them in all the area municipalities. Quite  
13 frankly we are not saying that there may not be a need  
14 for some of the day nurseries but we are saying that the  
15 basis for establishing them would no longer be on a  
16 logical basis or as a result of actual need. It would be  
17 on a question of equal demand - "We are paying the same  
18 tax: we should therefore have the same thing."

19 This I can say not only about day nurseries,  
20 but it could apply to many other functions, the welfare  
21 functions such as nursing home care. The rates now  
22 paid by the City of Toronto for this care are \$5.50 a  
23 day whereas the rates in the suburbs are \$3.50 to \$5.00  
24 a day.

25 I do not think it is a case of saying that  
26 you can pay less to somebody because you can beat them  
27 in the suburbs. I think it is more of a case.....  
28 We have the same situation. We have a downtown office  
29 where we lose secretaries to go to jobs in suburban  
30 offices at less pay because it is closer to home. There





1 are many reasons why a person may take less pay in one  
2 area than they will in another.

3 It is estimated by our Welfare Department  
4 on this day care alone that if it were all centralized  
5 with just the existing service there would be a \$40,000.00  
6 a year increase immediately. I do not think we can kid  
7 ourselves to say that the rates will equalize off. They  
8 will go right up to the top figure.

9 Also the provision of drugs to welfare  
10 recipients is a permissive service and it is provided  
11 in all municipalities in Metro Toronto. However, the  
12 system of providing the drugs within the City of Toronto  
13 is completely different from that in the suburban areas.  
14 This may be quite justifiable because of the size of  
15 their municipality or other problems they may have.

16 However, their costs are very much greater  
17 than in the suburbs and there is no doubt that if they  
18 were merged it would all go to that one system which  
19 would just shoot the costs up again in the other.

20 There is also the question that if  
21 centralization of authority - and this, I think, is the  
22 most important thing in welfare - if centralization  
23 of authority means a structure of administration in  
24 which certain rules are laid down and you follow those  
25 rules, we feel the existing flexible interpretation of  
26 regulations in the local areas with adjustments to meet  
27 individual case needs would disappear.

28 We believe local decisions as to whether  
29 supplements should be granted to an elderly person for  
30 instance living with a son or daughter is one example.





1 This should be left to a personal decision. We should  
2 never forget that welfare cases are not statistics; they  
3 are people. The larger the unit of government the  
4 greater the tendency is for them to become statistics  
5 rather than to be treated on a personal basis.

6 Even now our experience has been with the  
7 services that are administered by the Metropolitan  
8 Government that the people requiring these services  
9 prefer to make their necessary contacts through the  
10 local municipal area office, not a Metro office at all -  
11 the local government office - where their enquiry  
12 receives more individual interest and consideration.

13 I am not criticizing the people in the  
14 Metro Welfare Department because frankly we have had  
15 the utmost co-operation from them. I am merely pointing  
16 out that the people, the individuals themselves, prefer  
17 to deal with somebody that they know locally.

18 Perhaps I might pass on from that into the  
19 question of fire. We can be very brief on the question  
20 of fire and make the simple statement of saying that  
21 this is obviously a local problem. In our brief we  
22 have said that because to us we do not see any other  
23 solution to it. Fire is a local problem.

24 But it might be wise if you wished to hear  
25 some of the reasons that we say it is a local problem,  
26 I could go into them - or do you wish me to just pass  
27 over it?

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You do not have to  
29 elaborate on that.

30 MR. STEELE: Just leave it as it stands?





1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes.

2 MR. STEELE: I would like to turn to  
3 public health and I would like to point out to you that  
4 this is a function in which we feel some of the duties  
5 should be taken over by a Metropolitan officer of health.  
6 There is no Metropolitan officer of health at the  
7 present time and all the matters that are of  
8 Metropolitan jurisdiction and involve health problems  
9 we think should be under the jurisdiction of a medical  
10 officer of health for the Metropolitan area, and all  
11 other public health matters should be continued under  
12 the medical officer of health of the local municipalities.

13 At the present time there are many matters  
14 in which there is some question as to under whose authority  
15 health aspects come and there are other matters which we  
16 believe are not being properly supervised from a public  
17 health point of view in many cases where the Metropolitan  
18 authority is relying on a local medical officer of health  
19 rather than turning to its own officer.

20 Under the Public Health Act it is the  
21 responsibility of the medical officer of health to  
22 consider sanitation problems, which we believe would in-  
23 clude sewage disposal plants, and water treatment plants.  
24 Garbage disposal and water treatment plants are exclusive-  
25 ly Metropolitan in jurisdiction.

26 While we believe an excellent job is being  
27 done by the Metropolitan authority under the supervision  
28 of the Ontario Water Resources Commission, we believe  
29 this is being done from an engineering point of view  
30 and possibly without true regard for health aspects.





1 We cannot point to any epidemic or  
2 problems. Fortunately there has not been one. I am  
3 not saying there will be one.

4 We do believe there should be a Metro  
5 Officer of Health actively on consultation on these  
6 new projects and also for inspection of the existing  
7 plants.

8 Another aspect that the Metro Health  
9 Officer might have is on air pollution. It is a  
10 Metro function and quite rightly so. We believe it  
11 involves many public health problems but there is  
12 no Metro Health Officer.

13 Now many licensing by-laws contain  
14 provision applicable to health and safety and we  
15 believe these licensing functions should remain with  
16 Metro, as opposed to the ones we are suggesting  
17 should be returned to the Municipality. Metro should  
18 have a Metro Officer of Health to be consulted,  
19 rather than having to rely on the local area Medical  
20 Officer of Health.

21 Milk plants are a serious problem. We  
22 believe in the Metro area that many of the milk plants  
23 are inspected by two or three or four different medical  
24 officers of health. One area won't accept the  
25 certificate of another area. We think because they  
26 are Metro-wide distribution they should be inspected  
27 by one Medical Officer of Health.

28 Bakeries and these mobile lunch prepar-  
29 ation vehicles should all be inspected. These fall  
30 into the licensing function. There should be some





Steele

1 control by a Metro Health Officer.

2 We also believe that in the location  
3 of hospitals and certain other health aspects, which  
4 I am not qualified to go into, that the planners and  
5 the Planning Board should consult a Medical Officer  
6 of Health. They possibly do it, but they are only  
7 local, not a Metro one.

8 Another function that the Health  
9 Department of the Metro Council might do is provide  
10 a health service for its servants. The Etobicoke  
11 Health Department provides this. We feel it is  
12 desirable. I am sure many other Municipalities do  
13 the same. Metro could provide this service.

14 I would also refer to the field of  
15 welfare. Many welfare cases involve health problems.  
16 There should be a Health Department of the Metro  
17 area that could be considered.

18 Turning loosely to another point:  
19 Hospital sanitation. Patients going to a hospital  
20 do not respect municipal boundaries. In Etobicoke  
21 the Health Officers inspect the hospital. We are not  
22 certain whether other Health Officers in other  
23 municipalities effectively inspect the hospitals in  
24 their areas. Perhaps they do. We don't know. We  
25 feel the Metro Health Officer should exercise his  
26 function in all areas under the Metro Council.

27 I would like to turn to the general  
28 brief again, Mr. Commissioner. I would like to state  
29 it is the opinion of the Township of Etobicoke that  
30 if the Metro form of government is reorganized the





1 details should be decided upon only after considering  
2 the following major factors. These are brought out  
3 on page 29 of the Etobicoke brief:

4 (a) The desirability of a form of  
5 government close to the people on matters of a strictly  
6 local nature;

7 (b) The most effective size of  
8 municipal units;

9 (c) Fair representation based on  
10 population and assessment;

11 (d) A structure that will have  
12 flexibility to provide for future growth.

13 Now, that is the summation of the  
14 Township of Etobicoke. There are many senior officers  
15 of the Township here and if you have any questions we  
16 will do our best to answer them now or at any later  
17 time in writing or at another hearing.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: On page 21 of your  
19 brief, under the heading of Local Problems and  
20 Projects, you have one item: The Handling of Minor  
21 Zoning By-law Variations.

22 Does Etobicoke favour a Metro zoning  
23 by-law?

24 MR. STEELE: No, we don't.

25 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you favour a  
26 uniform building by-law?

27 MR. STEELE: To a very great extent, but  
28 I don't know that we can say that we favour one  
29 building by-law for the whole Metro area.

30 As you know, Mr. Chairman, Etobicoke has





1 cooperated with the Building Commissioner or the  
2 Committee working on a uniform building code.  
3 Etobicoke has adopted to date, I think, all of the  
4 recommendations of that Committee. I don't know that  
5 we would like to say there should be one by-law for  
6 the whole Metro area.

7                   Bearing in mind there are different  
8 problems in different parts of the Municipality, the  
9 legislation of Ontario provides in towns you can  
10 have different building by-laws in different parts  
11 of the Municipality. This would be going contrary  
12 to that concept, to say there should be one building  
13 by-law for Metro.

14                   We believe there should be a great  
15 deal of uniformity but we are not convinced there  
16 should be one by-law.

17                   THE COMMISSIONER: You mentioned fire  
18 protection as a local matter. I told you that you  
19 didn't have to develop that. Perhaps I was wrong.  
20 Are you suggesting there is no inter-municipal interest  
21 in fire protection?

22                   MR. STEELE: We are suggesting in  
23 cases of emergency, yes. As a general rule, no. In  
24 the case of an emergency there are provisions under  
25 the Fire Marshals' Act for cooperation between Departments.  
26 Etobicoke has an agreement with the three lakeshore  
27 municipalities and the fire trucks go from one municipi-  
28 pality to another. Once they do go they are under the  
29 control of the Fire Chief of the Department of the  
30 Municipality within which the fire is.





1 We believe that any minor amount of  
2 inter-municipal problems can be handled by these  
3 agreements. If you take an area like Etobicoke we  
4 are in a situation with geographically about 70% or  
5 more of our boundaries defined by river or railways.  
6 In effect there are very limited accesses across them.  
7 There are also very many different problems in fire  
8 fighting in, say, Etobicoke than there would be in  
9 New Toronto or the City of Toronto.

10 Etobicoke has been built up from very  
11 rigid zoning standards. We have open areas between  
12 factories and so on. We have different types of  
13 equipment that must be required than in other  
14 municipalities. We don't think it is a unified thing.  
15 We think the existing legislation is quite adequate.  
16 We have availed ourselves of it.

17 THE COMMISSIONER: I have one more  
18 question. You say in your brief that the Metro  
19 form of government should be endorsed once and for  
20 all. You talk of the record of achievement, a proud  
21 record, under any circumstances a remarkable record,  
22 and so on. Then you go on to say that the history of  
23 the Metropolitan Toronto Council gives ample evidence  
24 of the "split" on most major issues that has  
25 continuously existed between those representatives  
26 of the city and those representing the other area  
27 municipalities.

28 If the record is as remarkable as you  
29 say, that split has not caused any damage, has it?

30 MR. STEELE: Perhaps we should have





1 qualified our remarkable record. The record is  
2 outstanding. There are some decisions of the Metro  
3 Council with which we don't agree. We feel the  
4 split caused them. This gets into the subjective  
5 rather than the objective. Mind you, this is a good  
6 many years ago when on the water rates vote the city  
7 lined up against the suburbs and the vote was carried  
8 because New Toronto went with the city. There have  
9 been two or three occasions where Etobicoke seriously  
10 disagreed with subsidies to the TTC. This has been a  
11 straight city-suburban vote. We don't agree with the  
12 results on some of these things.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: You have mentioned  
14 two or three issues. I admit some are important. You  
15 talk of a split on most major issues that has  
16 continuously existed. Are you not exaggerating?

17 MR. STEELE: Perhaps we do, Mr. Chairman.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Is there not at times  
19 a split on the local area Council too?

20 MR. STEELE: Very much. The only  
21 difficulty we find, coming back to the comments I made  
22 earlier, the split usually ends up with the one solid  
23 party, the Toronto party voting and perhaps one of  
24 the renegade suburbs. When you have a division of  
25 voting strength we believe there is a great tendency  
26 towards this and perhaps many of the votes have gone  
27 on this idea, "Metro doesn't work very well, we better  
28 get into amalgamation."

29 THE COMMISSIONER: You are not alone in  
30 talking of the achievements of Metro. Every brief that





1 has been presented to me to date has used language of  
2 the same kind.

3 MR. STEELE: Mr. Commissioner, our  
4 point of view is this: I think Etobicoke could  
5 quite honestly say it did not need Metro to begin with.  
6 It could have gone on its own merry way by itself.  
7 Even today it probably does not need Metro. We believe  
8 the Metro form of government is the best form of  
9 government for the overall problems. For that reason  
10 we are not advocating we break away from Metro. We  
11 like the Metro system. We think it is good. We  
12 think it could be improved and we think it should  
13 carry on.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very much.  
15 I will adjourn now for five minutes.

16 ---A SHORT ADJOURNMENT.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1                    SUBMISSION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

2    APPEARANCES:    Reeve True Davidson

3                    MISS DAVIDSON:    Mr. Commissioner, I  
4    am not going to attempt to read you all the material  
5    that I have with me here. It is simply for reference  
6    in case you ask me one of those embarrassing questions  
7    for which you are famous.

8                    THE COMMISSIONER:    I would not embarrass  
9    you for the world, Miss Davidson.

10                   MISS DAVIDSON:    Thank you very much.  
11    The Township of East York believes that government  
12    exists for the people, not the people for the government.  
13    We are very much orientated towards the human side  
14    of government. We feel that in municipal affairs  
15    this is particularly true because this is the gathering  
16    of a group of citizens to perform work for their  
17    mutual advantage, which none of them could perform  
18    singly. The connection with their immediate lives  
19    is more important to them for more of the time than is  
20    the case with Provincial or Federal policies.

21                   East York is quite an old community.  
22    The village of Todmorden grew up around Todmorden Mills  
23    in the Don Valley. We still have two of the oldest  
24    houses in the Metro area. Todmorden Mills were staffed  
25    by millhands from Yorkshire and Lancashire from the  
26    Village of Todmorden in that community. The spirit  
27    of the sturdy Yorkshire men and Lancashire men gave a  
28    permanent bias, and I use the word "bias" in a good  
29    sense, to the development of the community which has  
30    survived. It is like the bias given by the Pilgram





1 Fathers or the Virginia planters to the development  
2 of the subsequent settlements in those areas.

3 The emblem of the Township of East York  
4 is the bulldog. It may not be beautiful, except to  
5 those who love it, but it is determined, pertinacious,  
6 loyal, strong and typically British in its thinking.

7 This is true of the Township of East  
8 York. We have large settlements of veterans who came  
9 after the first war and the second war. The community  
10 spirit was crystallized during the depression when  
11 we suffered very greatly. We were under the control  
12 of the Department of Municipal Affairs for a time  
13 and hardship draws communities together.

14 The loyalty of the Scotsman to his  
15 country is not less than the loyalty of the Italian  
16 because life is harder in Scotland than in Italy.  
17 Many of the people in East York are old timers. They  
18 have a deep and permanent feeling about the Township.  
19 Council is not acting on its own responsibility or  
20 out of its own greed and desire to be big frogs in  
21 little puddles, but out of an attempt to interpret  
22 the will of the people in the community.

23 In connection with this community  
24 feeling to us this is something which is worth preserving  
25 and our approach to the Metro government is coloured  
26 by our desire to preserve this.

27 At a planning convention recently in  
28 Boston -- I am leading up to it, Mr. Commissioner -- this  
29 is not in the brief.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: No, that is all right.





1 I was just looking for something.

2 MISS DAVIDSON: At a recent Planning  
3 Convention in Boston a member of the East York staff  
4 was present at a panel discussion in which they were  
5 considering the problems of annexation and one person  
6 after another said that there should be more power  
7 given to the Planning Board on central cities to  
8 annex surrounding areas so that they could establish  
9 efficient government. The last speaker was from the  
10 City of Boston. He said this was not so. What was  
11 needed -- on the contrary, what was needed was power  
12 to dismember the central city and bring it down to a  
13 size which could be handled effectively.

14 In the discussions the representative  
15 of the Township was talking to a representative of  
16 some other part of Metro, I think they must be from a  
17 bigger part rather than a smaller one because I don't  
18 think anyone from a small community would have said  
19 that. They said, "Excuse me if I tell you something.  
20 While I do not know some members of my Council because  
21 I do think I'm in the library, he said, /that the rest of us are always  
22 going around talking about communities. Doesn't he  
23 know that East York is the only community in Metro  
24 and none of us or the rest of us know what she is  
25 yapping about, trying to preserve -- I don't think  
26 they used the term "yapping". That is my term.

27 I was telling this as a joke to a member  
28 of the Library Board when we were discussing the opening  
29 of Heaton Collegiate which has now a new collection of  
30 books on Municipal Affairs and Planning. It has been





Davidson

1 opened in our library in memory of our past Comptroller  
2 who died about a year ago, and we were talking about  
3 other things that had been given to the library and  
4 the feeling that the community had for the library  
5 and I told this story and one of the members of the  
6 Library Board, who is also on the Central Executive  
7 of the Cancer Society said, "Oh, no, East York is  
8 not the only community that are reorganizing." He  
9 said, "My wife is one of the beach bums who still  
10 think that the beaches are the only community that  
11 is worth living in in Toronto, and acting on her  
12 advice, I have raised this suggestion and we are  
13 trying to get community organizations rather than  
14 municipality organizations".

15 " In connection with the Cancer Society  
16 drives we find that in making these appeals we get  
17 more staff than we ever got before." He thinks the  
18 same thing will be true, comparably with other areas  
19 of Toronto. He believes that people will work through  
20 their own community better than you can get in any  
21 other way.

22 Now, in connection -- I just mention  
23 this -- I am now getting to the actual context of  
24 the brief. In our brief we urge survival of the  
25 communities where they exist and attempt to revise them,  
26 not necessarily as an actual basis of municipal  
27 government but in some sort of advisory committees and  
28 a reorganization which will give the people of every  
29 community that exists or which may be revised through  
30 Metropolitan government a feeling that they really share





1 in the government. We feel this produces better  
2 representation and more interest in elections and more  
3 citizenship participation throughout the year.

4 The size of a community is a delicate  
5 question and it is particularly delicate in East York  
6 because my -- although I wouldn't want this to be  
7 stated publicly -- and I hope there are no reporters  
8 present -- East York is in fact an ideal size for a  
9 community in Metropolitan Toronto. Our brief mentions  
10 the various figures, the average supporting Toronto,  
11 the average supporting Metropolitan and it shows  
12 what is indicated for a provincial riding and so on.  
13 And I would agree that these 72,000 people is just  
14 about as close as any municipality of Metropolitan  
15 Toronto.

16 Actually when Dr. Rose was here,  
17 studying a defence of the Metropolitan system against  
18 amalgamation, he said that some of the smaller  
19 communities would have to be submerged in the larger  
20 ones. He mentioned the larger ones, Etobicoke, North  
21 York, York and Scarboro and he mentioned the smaller  
22 ones, but the total only came to twelve. He didn't  
23 mention East York. I can only conclude this was simply  
24 because he didn't know what to do with East York. It  
25 obviously is not large or small. It is just right,  
26 like the size that Alice tried to get to in Alice in  
27 Wonderland. First she was too small and then she was  
28 too large and finally she got back to human size. East  
29 York is human size.

30 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want me to try





1 that out on Dr. Rose? He is appearing before me at  
2 a future hearing.

3 MISS DAVIDSON: I would be pleased if  
4 you would ask him why he omitted East York from this  
5 article.

6 Our feeling is that we do have this  
7 strong community feeling. We do not want to place  
8 ourselves in a position of saying certain communities  
9 are too small. We face the question that there is no  
10 minimum. We put it as low as we thought it was possible  
11 to provide services of all kinds. We did not feel in  
12 the abstract that it should be permanent. A viable  
13 community should be able to provide all the services  
14 for the urban dweller. We felt that perhaps 40,000  
15 was as low as you could go in this respect and still  
16 provide them.

17 We were influenced in this by the  
18 smallest ward in the City of Toronto because we felt  
19 that Toronto was difficult to change. It is a very  
20 old city and highly respected city. We all love it  
21 and admire it, however we may fight with it. You love  
22 and admire your parents even though you fight with  
23 them.

24 We feel it is going to be very difficult  
25 to change. Therefore, we suggested there is a range  
26 from the smallest ward in the City of Toronto to the  
27 largest population group, which would be around 80,000.

28 We suggested this as best for first  
29 representation; that representation thereafter be  
30 given in multiples according to the half or more major





1 proportion of this field.

2 We did not deal at all -- we did not  
3 try to deal with the number of multiples of this  
4 figure which ought to be a minimum for a community.  
5 We recognized that probably most people would say  
6 100,000 or 150,000 would be the ideal size. And the  
7 tendency of East York, shall we say, like Etobicoke,  
8 was to make clear we were willing to cooperate in  
9 whatever community we were aligned with. If we were  
10 aligned with another community, we would attempt to  
11 work with them happily.

12 We do feel, however, we would not like  
13 to be lost in a community larger than that. It would  
14 be impossible for us to preserve any vestige of this --  
15 again this Citizen Council joint activity that has  
16 been the practice through the years so that we do not  
17 want to be put into the City of Toronto in a four or  
18 five city system because we do not like -- it is not  
19 because we would not feel in many ways we had interests  
20 in common with Toronto and could work along with Toronto  
21 people in Metropolitan Council, as indeed we have in  
22 some cases. It is because we think Toronto is too  
23 big a community and would not want to make it bigger.  
24 We would rather make it smaller if it were possible.

25 We feel that it is ridiculous that the  
26 unit of representation in the Metropolitan Council  
27 should be larger than the unit of representation in  
28 the Provincial government. Why should a man or woman  
29 who has to be familiar with all the little details  
30 of the life of his people or her people, have to





1 represent a larger group of people than any Provincial  
2 or Federal member who has to know things of his or  
3 her people only in the broad outlines of community  
4 interests rather than -- although he will interest  
5 himself in applications for Mother's Allowances and  
6 things of that kind, veteran's pensions -- yet by and  
7 large he doesn't need to know his community as  
8 intimately as the representative on the Metropolitan  
9 Council.

10 That is why we feel there should be  
11 representation in reasonably small groups, then if  
12 larger groups are joined, in order to create  
13 communities that you can consider viable for urban  
14 living.

15 We have not gone at all into the  
16 problems which may arise through a large Council. This  
17 is my personal comment and has not been confirmed  
18 by Council, but I would feel that a Council of 20 is  
19 not a great improvement on a Council of 24 unless you  
20 were to get a very small Council.

21 The East York Council is just about  
22 the ideal size, just as East York Township is the ideal  
23 size. Every member of the East York Council acts as  
24 a chairman of a committee and is an expert in his own  
25 field.

26 I wouldn't personally feel on the question,  
27 if my Council would feel that, there would be anything  
28 sinister about a large Council. If you had reorganized  
29 it administratively so we understood what would be  
30 different, more on the basis of the large Councils abroad.





1 We have not attempted to solve this.

2 For example, in the reorganization,  
3 we would feel that the actual Council system will  
4 work out all local boundaries in detail and that  
5 will be something that probably would be studied  
6 after the general lines of reorganization took place.  
7 I would be glad to place our people at your disposal  
8 if you desire them.

9 On page 9 there is a dash omitted, if  
10 I may draw your attention to it, in the third last  
11 line of the second paragraph there should be a dash  
12 after the word "Eglinton". Otherwise the meaning is  
13 not clear. That is the only further comment I have  
14 on that section of our brief which has to do with  
15 size.

16 We did not consider perhaps -- I had  
17 originally not intended to say anything about  
18 representation at all because I feel this had been  
19 fully discussed by other people and will be fully  
20 discussed by other people and possibly other alternatives  
21 will be presented to you many times in the course of  
22 these discussions.

23 We feel that this was discussed -- I would  
24 feel that it is on the basis of representation that --  
25 at least on the basis of population that representation  
26 should be determined. I would take issue with anyone  
27 who suggested that it should be done on the basis of  
28 assessment. The Five City Plan or the Four City Plan  
29 that were recommended in the Gathercole Report really  
30 was recommended by Mr. Gardiner. Mr. Gathercole in the





1 report merely had the financial studies which required  
2 to see what would happen under amalgamation under the  
3 Five City or under the Four City Plan. Someone said  
4 he recommended one of these plans. I think if you  
5 examine the questions leading up to that report you  
6 will see he presented the facts and the projection of  
7 the facts under the three suggested possible changes.  
8 He didn't consider which of those was the best or  
9 whether some other might not be better; but in all of  
10 this, he left Scarboro separate and Scarboro's financial  
11 problems are worse than anybody else in the area,  
12 unless it is East York.

13 It didn't solve that at all. Nothing  
14 but amalgamation would solve this but it would present  
15 greater problems, we feel, administratively than would  
16 accrue in good, as well as in financial problems.

17 We feel sure that you out of your wisdom  
18 and your vast experience will recommend -- assisted  
19 by Mr. Finnis are going to recommend some sort of  
20 financial reform which will assist equalization of the --  
21 if you recommend -- let's not assume that you are going  
22 to -- if you recommend adoption of the Metropolitan  
23 system, or if you recommend changes, it will help the  
24 equalization burden on the various municipalities so  
25 that they can operate on a reasonable basis.

26 Certainly the financial burdens which  
27 have been placed by the Metropolitan Council on the local  
28 areas within the last couple of years are very, very  
29 grievous on a municipality like East York with a low  
30 per capita assessment and with very little industrial





1 assessment. The relation of our debt structure to our  
2 total assessment is such that we will have to be  
3 exceedingly careful in the coming years because we  
4 bear our share of the Metropolitan debt and it has  
5 increased so very greatly and will, I think, continue  
6 to increase from TTC grants and through assumption of  
7 total school costs and various other matters; so if  
8 no financial rearrangement is possible, East York  
9 will be extremely restricted.

10 Now, we still want to be independent.  
11 We are the independent kind. We will cut our cloth  
12 to fit our garment. We will continue to have the  
13 best municipality in Metro.

14 I would hope that, without attempting  
15 to have Metro take over everything, because this leads  
16 to further extravagance, that there will be some  
17 method devised to improve the general financial  
18 situation in our area.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You have no specific  
20 suggestion?

21 MISS DAVIDSON: I will have some in my  
22 own brief. We are independent even in Council. The  
23 whole Council is here today. They are ready to like  
24 throw a bomb at me if I speak out of turn. I quite  
25 realize this.

26 We did not attempt to go into too much  
27 detail in our briefs because we wanted to be sure it  
28 was unanimous and then anything we wanted to add we  
29 could put in separately.

30 The major point I would like to discuss





1 with you is the matter of the services because this  
2 is something that a large number of communities have  
3 not been -- although I notice that Etobicoke went into  
4 some detail on some matters and I do not think we have  
5 raised too much difference with most of it that they  
6 suggested.

7 I might add that a great many of the  
8 splits to which Mr. Steele referred between the City  
9 and Suburbs were in connection with the assessment  
10 of new services or with the definition of the terms  
11 of references in regard to services. Many of those  
12 had to do with what I would call administrative  
13 decisions arising out of the Metropolitan form of  
14 government.

15 We feel that representations under  
16 Bill 80 were too rigid and that any representational  
17 changes should be flexible and should allow for  
18 adjustment as population changes.

19 We felt that as far as services were  
20 concerned that Bill 80 was much too open and led to  
21 too strong a temptation to communities who felt that  
22 they wanted things they could not afford which put  
23 them into a position of being over their depths in  
24 some fields.

25 It presented too great a temptation  
26 to certain people to try to get Metro to take over  
27 these fields.

28 A great deal of the difficulty in Metro  
29 and a great deal of the wastage of time and bitterness  
30 has arisen out of the fact of attempts to have Metro





Davidson

1 take over the various services from local municipalities.  
2 This caused the City and Suburbs to split more than  
3 anything else. It has extended itself into the  
4 election of officials and so on.

5 County government is recognized as a  
6 democratic form of government. It is subject to change.  
7 County government is taking over welfare. The  
8 Provincial Government is recognizing the County  
9 system to allow, I understand, certain new privileges  
10 and powers which, by and large, the communities of the  
11 rest of Ontario feel they need. This is what has been  
12 going on in the Metropolitan system in the past and  
13 we hope this will be cleared up now once and for all.

14 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you think it is  
15 really possible to make a final apportionment of  
16 responsibility? In my experience in all human  
17 relations there is no finality.

18 MISS DAVIDSON: No. I suppose this is  
19 true and I appreciate the County system is subject  
20 to change. There is one way to approach a change  
21 and there is another. The first way is you assume you  
22 have a good system and you are going to let it go for  
23 some time. The second is that you have an interim  
24 system and that you are going to have to change it  
25 all the time. It is the second assumption that has  
26 encouraged the Metropolitan Council in the last ten  
27 years and I would hope it would be the first that you  
28 are underlining from now on.

29 In connection with libraries, I want to  
30 make a slight correction here. We mentioned \$8,000.00





1 and possibly another \$7,000.00. The figure has now  
2 been set for Metro this year. Metro is now paying  
3 \$3,300.00 so East York is paying around \$1,500.00.  
4 This would add very materially to our total book  
5 purchases for this year. We had to cut our book  
6 purchases last year. This is just about the difference  
7 between the book purchases we made this year and last  
8 year. We only have a certain amount we can spend for  
9 the libraries. We know it will be better spent in  
10 East York. We feel that the Central Library is a  
11 provincial responsibility.

12 We do not like the two level system  
13 in school boards and we would not want to see it for  
14 the libraries. Our Library Board, however, is  
15 submitting its own brief.

16 I will skip to welfare. I have nothing  
17 to add what we have said on ambulances and fire. In  
18 welfare I would like to, in the first place -- I would  
19 like to point out the last sentence referring to the  
20 hospital grants. Essentially we say here: "We believe  
21 senior levels of government and the Ontario Hospital  
22 Insurance scheme should not need support from the limited  
23 field of municipal finance."

24 We mean the senior levels of government,  
25 and again with hospital buildings, we are very much  
26 opposed on the basis of the present hospital grants  
27 in Metro and I know I have my Council behind me because  
28 I talked to them first about this.

29 I feel myself it was possible to make a  
30 case for specific hospitals in the outer areas where





1 there is a lack of emergency treatment and treatment  
2 for minor routine surgical and hospital cases but  
3 the Metro money, I think, is going largely to teach  
4 and for specialized hospitals, which are related to  
5 provincial hospitals and we feel this is improper.

6 We object to the amalgamation of the  
7 welfare services and it is not because we are behind  
8 with our welfare services. We have operated very  
9 economically. We have been progressive in our  
10 thinking and I would like to point out we have several  
11 new services in East York which resulted from studies  
12 over the past four years.

13 This year we have established a  
14 visiting homemakers' service to provide visiting  
15 homemaking service for the aged. We have a great many  
16 more aged in East York. We have a larger proportion  
17 of aged than most of Metro because many people are  
18 living in homes they built with their own hands and  
19 which they have occupied since their youth. There  
20 are also many people who were born there and this is  
21 an unusual situation for any Metropolitan municipality.

22 We are operating these services to enable  
23 people to stay in their own homes as long as they can  
24 without having to go to a nursing home.

25 Last night we had a very large rally  
26 with nearly 100 people there from one of the community's  
27 organizations to plan a practical service for juvenile  
28 delinquents. We are the fifth lowest in Metro for  
29 juvenile delinquency but we don't like to see even as  
30 much as that. We feel it should either be lower than





ANGUS, STONEHOUSE & CO. LTD.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO

Davidson

272

1 that or we should have none at all.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30





1                   So you will see that a small community  
2 without spending a great deal of money, if it has thought-  
3 ful people..... I work for the day care referral  
4 office and with the visiting homemakers' service for  
5 the aged. We have a friendly visiting service for the  
6 aged and we are trying to get a door-to-door library  
7 service for the aged. These things arise out of the  
8 appointment of a committee of the local area planning  
9 council.

10                   We supplement by means of our community  
11 energy and interest the activities for which the Council  
12 has to pay. We feel that this is of great value and  
13 that it would be lost under an amalgamated system.

14                   I may say that we recently had to appoint a  
15 new Welfare Officer. Our Welfare Officer is retiring.  
16 We had two applicants from the staff of a very large  
17 urban municipality who seemed to have very fine qualifi-  
18 cations. But when we came to talk to them we found they  
19 knew nothing about anything except one thing.

20                   One man had been working entirely with  
21 employable unemployed men. This was the only thing he  
22 knew anything about. In our discussion with these two  
23 applicants we felt that there was no way in a very  
24 large system for one person to deal with the whole  
25 family. There was no way of focusing everything.  
26 Everything was so departmentalized that there might be  
27 five or six different departments working with one man  
28 or one family. We found there was a great value in  
29 having one person who knew the whole circumstances.

30                   Our Welfare Department is very small. When





1 I first became Reeve everybody thought: "She will be a  
2 push-over." For the first year or two I used to have  
3 people phoning me on Saturday or Sunday with sad stories  
4 and I used to take food over myself or guarantee bills  
5 at drug stores. But I very soon found out that all I  
6 had to do was phone Mr. Vernon and he knew every one of  
7 these cases and could tell me which ones were deserving  
8 and which were not. If it was anything new he would  
9 investigate it himself even at the weekend.

10 The reason we sometimes do not pay as much  
11 for nursing homes and other services is because we know  
12 the individuals. We can say to a nursing home: "This  
13 chap is ambulatory: he will take care of himself" -  
14 and pay a little less. For somebody else who needs  
15 constant bed care we pay a little more.

16 In a large city you have to standardize  
17 these things and once they are standardized nobody is  
18 going to go over them or under them because he will be  
19 making a mistake. In a department with a very long  
20 chain of command the safe thing is to keep to the line;  
21 that is all you can do. Therefore <sup>it</sup> is the top line that  
22 you keep to.

23 In connection with schools we feel that the  
24 takeover of buildings costs is an example of what hap-  
25 pens when you unify some expenditure. This is one of  
26 the reasons we do not like the idea of amalgamation.  
27 We do not like the idea of Metro taking over more  
28 services.

29 As soon as the Metropolitan Council this  
30





1 year agreed that it would take over the total cost of  
2 buildings there has been such a spate of building  
3 activity by the local school boards that it is ridiculous.  
4 Part of it is the desire to take advantage of the  
5 municipal loan fund. But I am a woman and have been  
6 in the habit of going to sales. I have realized not  
7 to let my head be turned by the promise of savings I get  
8 by buying the things I cannot afford. I wish I could  
9 feel that the Metropolitan Council and the Metropolitan  
10 School Board had the same approach.

11 In our effort to obtain the Federal grants  
12 we have expended money in a way that I think should make  
13 our financing difficult over the next decade.

14 However, that is a personal opinion. The  
15 only point that I can properly raise at this time is  
16 that everybody now wants a general purpose room at every  
17 school; they want a school library in every school.

18 I hope Mr. McHardy is still here. Yes he  
19 is. He is making notes of all I have forgotten when I  
20 was on the School Board.

21 I am reminded when I see all these libraries  
22 going in of a story told by an American planner when he  
23 was discussing projectitis, the disease that inflicts so  
24 many of us now. We want arts centres and sports  
25 centres and this, that and the other. We have it in  
26 East York, but I know it is a contagious disease and it  
27 spreads everywhere.

28 I am reminded of a very large sports arena  
29 with all sorts ancillary features built in one of the  
30 small western towns during the depression. This was





1 done with government help. Then they could not afford  
2 to heat and light it and the building remained an empty  
3 monument to the futility of spending capital to put up  
4 structures you cannot maintain and service properly.

5 I think this will not occur in Metropolitan  
6 Toronto, but you might find libraries without librarians  
7 in future in the schools.

8 I want to deal with urban renewal as such,  
9 but I have something to say later when I deal with  
10 planning. There are some statements by the Township  
11 that I would like to read at that time.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: May I just ask you one  
13 question? The first part of your first sentence on  
14 urban renewal says: "Public housing should be a Metro  
15 responsibility but it should be conducted in conformity  
16 with the plans and zoning regulations of the municipali-  
17 ties concerned."

18 What effect would this have on public  
19 housing? Would it help public housing?

20 MISS DAVIDSON: I do not think it <sup>would</sup> either  
21 help or hinder it. It might create a certain limi-  
22 tation on the activities of the housing authorities in  
23 selecting sites.

24 May I give you an example from the Township  
25 of East York? Recently the Metropolitan Welfare  
26 Committee decided it was going to build public housing  
27 on a site and East York zoned for single family housing.  
28 More than two or three blocks away was another area  
29 where they were going to do what we call R.2 building -  
30 that is, terrace houses and semi-detached. This is R.2





1 in our zoning. This was zoned R.1 and it impinges  
2 one of the best residential R.1 areas in the Township.  
3 Not more than three or four blocks away was an area  
4 zoned R.2.

5 The situation was like this. Here is the  
6 very high grade housing that was built on the site of  
7 the former Woodbine race course with its little ravines  
8 and beautiful big homes. This was one of the most  
9 expensive areas in the Township. Then it tapers down  
10 a bit with single family residential of a less expensive  
11 kind. Then we had a zone beyond this for R2 and then  
12 a zone for R3 which is apartments, right along Dawes  
13 Road, which is a very busy street. Were were going to  
14 taper down gradually from this expensive housing through  
15 to the apartments and nobody would beplunk right up  
16 against housing of a widely different type.

17 There was very great objection on the part  
18 of the Township and eventually Metro Council saw the  
19 force of our objections and agreed to this and has with-  
20 drawn the housing plan there.

21 We will facilitate in any way possible the  
22 establishment of public housing in this R2 zone if they  
23 care to go ahead and use it. It might allow a township  
24 or a municipality that did not want public housing to  
25 try some tricky re-zoning to prevent this, but there is  
26 always an opportunity for the Metropolitan Planning Board  
27 to object to re-zoning and it would be pretty clear if  
28 the re-zoning took place at the time the public housing  
29 was suggested that it was being done for that purpose.

30 But I could not say the Metropolitan Council





1 had any more right than any other developer to insist  
2 that land which was zoned R1 be re-zoned R2 so that  
3 they could build what they wanted to build. We do not  
4 do this with developers unless they can show really  
5 fine site plans and unless the people in the area have  
6 no objections. They have an opportunity to object to  
7 the re-zoning.

8 I think the law-givers ought to abide by  
9 the law.

10 In connection with planning I would like to  
11 read from the comments of the Township of East York, the  
12 Planning Board and the Council, on the proposed draft  
13 official plan of the Metropolitan Toronto planning area.  
14 I will be glad to leave this copy with you if you would  
15 like to look at it later.

16 "There are two basic - and opposing -  
17 points of view concerning the character of a  
18 Metropolitan plan. The first, which seems to  
19 be the basis of this plan, is that it should  
20 be a single comprehensive master plan created,  
21 as it were, from the top down and that the  
22 local municipalities should act as agents of  
23 Metro, implementing the Metro policy by the  
24 use of standardized formulae. The second is  
25 that the plan should be created from the bottom  
26 up and be the sum of all its parts (i.e., that  
27 the individual official plans of the local  
28 municipalities which together form the  
29 federation of Metro) and that these should  
30 have as much individuality and variation one





1 from another as is possible, the Metro  
2 plan being the cement to bind these  
3 aggregates together.

4 It is suggested that both these  
5 views are extreme and each, if applied  
6 throughout the area, would create difficulties.  
7 The planning problem of our time is to  
8 evolve forms of planning on a scale suf-  
9 ficiently big to deal efficiently with the  
10 technical problems of expansion and at the  
11 same time small enough to have concern for  
12 problems at the human scale. In the final  
13 analysis the human needs should be given  
14 at last equal prominence with the technical.  
15 Man's purpose in creating for himself an  
16 artificial or modified environment has always  
17 been to facilitate his social as well as his  
18 economic activities.

19 There is therefore a need for a system  
20 whereby policy can be made at the two dif-  
21 ferent scales of man and of machine - if the  
22 sometimes apparently irrational desires of  
23 man are not to be submerged and the needs  
24 of efficient administration and modern  
25 techniques are not to be frustrated."

26 I do not think they are irrational myself,  
27 by the way. I think people know what they need. They  
28 need the security, they need the feeling of being a  
29 part of a community. They need the support. We do  
30 not get it from large families any more. We have to get





1 it from our community.

2 "The appended detailed comments" - and  
3 so on.

4 "In considering the problem of how such  
5 a double standard can be applied the following  
6 might be noted.

7 In the outer areas new widespread  
8 development takes place on virgin land where  
9 there is little existing developed property  
10 and therefore primitive existing social and  
11 business organization. In such areas proposed  
12 new land uses can quite properly be required to  
13 fit into and around planned or established  
14 Metro technical projects or policies and the  
15 Metro function can properly take precedence  
16 over local.

17 Conversely, in settled areas policy  
18 making and projects (private or public) should  
19 have regard for the rights of existing  
20 developed property and for the complex and  
21 delicate tissue of human relationships" -  
22 such as Metro roads which cut residential communities  
23 off from the services which their taxes helped to  
24 create. They cut through them, move their ravines  
25 which the community regards as the park centre of the  
26 neighbourhood.

27 There are all sorts of ways in which Metro  
28 can act. Take the matter of parking - a road that  
29 becomes a Metropolitan road and parking is forbidden.  
30 The merchants who have put their life savings into little





1 stores along that route in the past when parking was  
2 permissible on the street are ruined because there is  
3 absolutely no way in which they can provide parking.  
4 There is no place in the district. They cannot afford  
5 it. And there is no way in which the Township can  
6 provide/<sup>it</sup>because the areas are not large enough and  
7 concentrated enough.

8 You may say that strip commercialization  
9 is not good any more, but strip commercialization was  
10 very valuable in the early days of our development and  
11 a lot of people are having their livelihood destroyed  
12 when we take this parking off the Metropolitan roads.

13 Perhaps Metro has a responsibility to create  
14 some relief for these people.

15 These are just examples.

16 "In these areas and for these reasons  
17 planning at the local level assumes a greater  
18 importance than may be the case in outer areas."

19 Our Planning Director has added here as a  
20 comment: "The bulldozer, a product of modern technology,  
21 is invaluable for major earth-moving operations but would  
22 be quite inappropriate for cultivating plants in a  
23 mature garden ."

24 We are very much opposed to strengthening  
25 - we have not had a chance to talk about this; we saw  
26 a reference to it in the paper - but I know from these  
27 comments and the general attitude of my Council that we  
28 are very much opposed, as is our Planning Board, to  
29 strengthening the position of the Metropolitan Planning  
30 Board to overrule local planning boards.





1                   The local planning board and the local  
2 council work together.   The local planning board works  
3 out what is desirable with the community.   We have  
4 constant public hearings.   The local planning board  
5 works out desirable plans and the council does the  
6 programming and determines which of these plans can be  
7 implemented and what must be faced and what perhaps cannot  
8 be considered at all at the present time.   But we need  
9 both and we feel that it is impossible.....

10                   I am one of the few people who will appear  
11 before you, Mr. Commissioner, who works on quite as many  
12 local and Metropolitan bodies.   I am a member of the  
13 Metropolitan Planning Board.   This is my fourth year of  
14 experience there as an Alderman or actual member and I  
15 know the members there cannot possibly.....   I am an  
16 eager beaver and I work like a dog and I cannot cover all  
17 the agenda in such a way that I really know intimately  
18 the background of everything that comes before me.   You  
19 cannot do it.   You would have to see the places yourself.

20                   Therefore we depend on our staff very much  
21 more than the local planning boards and local councils  
22 depend on their staffs, because they come from a limited  
23 area.   When we are discussing some project we can refer  
24 to the actual buildings and we know who lives there and  
25 who operates a store and what has been there before and  
26 how people think about things.   This cannot be done on  
27 the Metropolitan level, so the Metropolitan Planning  
28 Board must confine itself to laying down the general out-  
29 line of the thing.

30                   Even then it should not, as was suggested





1 recently----I suppose you have read the papers and know  
2 that there was a little discussion at the Metropolitan  
3 Planning Board not too long ago about whether its  
4 function was to implement the decisions of the  
5 Metropolitan Council or to do good planning in the  
6 abstract. The close connection between the two at  
7 Metro seems to have worked conversely from the way it  
8 works in East York at least. The Planning Board  
9 discusses the thing first in East York and then Council  
10 decides it. But in Metro the Council seems to decide  
11 it, or the staff decides it, and then the Planning Board  
12 is asked to approve of it.

13 Perhaps that is unfair criticism. I am  
14 making it off-the-cuff and would not want it to be taken  
15 as expressing a settled opinion.

16 On Page 15 we say: "There are many requests  
17 from the City of Toronto that Metro should take over its  
18 varied responsibilities" - what we mean is the financial  
19 responsibility in this case. There has never been any  
20 suggestion that Metro would take over the operation of  
21 any of these functions. They merely pay for them.

22 Our objection is to the fact that control  
23 should go with the cost, and we have a recommendation  
24 connected with that. It seems obvious.

25 In the end we come back to the same story  
26 that we have presented in the beginning. We believe  
27 that there is a value in a local community and that  
28 local community life should be preserved.

29 I do not know whether you have read  
30 Jane Jacob's Death and Life of Great American Cities,





1 but when I read it I was delighted with it because you  
2 would have thought she was describing East York.

3

4

5

6 -

7

8

9

10

11 -

12

13

14

15

16 -

17

18

19

20

21

22 -

23

24

25

26

27

28 -

29

30





1 I told you a little incident that  
2 happened not so long ago. I will tell you something  
3 about the barber shops and hairdressers. We don't have  
4 a newspaper and this is where news is disseminated.  
5 It is like going into a club. You find out the latest  
6 news.

7 THE COMMISSIONER: That is unfair  
8 competition to the press.

9 MISS DAVIDSON: Of course, if the press  
10 gave us coverage perhaps we would not need to go to  
11 the hairdressing parlors.

12 We had a man in East York on the Board  
13 of Education, a barber for 12 years. He was a man  
14 of great capacity and he had a heart attack and was  
15 unable to pursue his trade. We had a vacancy in what  
16 we then called the job of truant officer and because  
17 this man had given us such outstanding service on the  
18 School Board and was free, we appointed him Attendance  
19 Officer.

20 He is now recognized as an authority  
21 in this field throughout the Province. He was on the  
22 first executive and helped organize the Ontario  
23 Attendance Officers Association. He is regarded as  
24 an authority on the subject.

25 This is what comes of citizen partici-  
26 pation in community life.

27 I quote another incident which also  
28 parallels Jane Jacobs. There were some new people who  
29 moved into my neighbourhood a few doors away. I won't  
30 say in which direction. There was a noisy party one





Davidson

1 night and I got up and looked out of the window --  
2 so I would have something to tell about at the  
3 hairdressing parlor! I looked out to see what was  
4 happening and I saw lights going on.

5 The next day I asked the police about  
6 it. I asked if they had had a lot of complaints and  
7 they said no, I was the only person that phoned them.  
8 I asked one of the neighbours the next day why there  
9 had not been any calls. She said, "When we saw your  
10 light go on we knew you would look after it."

11 East York is the kind of place where you  
12 can say to the Eatons man, "If I am not in leave the  
13 parcel at my neighbours". It is a small town. This  
14 is exactly what builds up community feeling. These  
15 are the things of which a good human life is made  
16 even in a city.

17 We would like to combine this with  
18 the excitement of an urban centre. East York is a  
19 working class community. Forest Hill is a wealthier  
20 community. I would like to see a variety of communities.  
21 I think this is what Council wants.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I said  
23 earlier, Mrs. Davidson, I would not embarrass you  
24 for the world. I have only one question and that is  
25 in reference to the statement you make on page 10 of  
26 the brief:

27 "The process of equalization by means  
28 of assistance payments of various kinds has been tried  
29 by the Metropolitan School Board and we feel it has  
30 led to competitive extravagance, annoying the rich





1 without saving the poor. We feel that some completely  
2 new approach is needed."

3 Could you prove that statement? Could  
4 you prove the truth of the statement?

5 MISS DAVIDSON: I don't know whether  
6 I can prove it or not. I would be glad to look up some  
7 statistics for you on the development of building  
8 programmes. Let me make two or three general statements.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking about  
10 maintenance assistance payments which are paid, as I  
11 understand it, to cover current costs?

12 MISS DAVIDSON: We say assistance payments  
13 of different kinds and I would say we are thinking more  
14 of the --

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Capital?

16 MISS DAVIDSON: Capital assistance.  
17 However, where one community feels that it is paying  
18 more than the others to help others it is going to  
19 get everything that it can itself.

20 Now I will give you an example from my  
21 own community so I won't be seeming to criticize one  
22 that is too often criticized by all of us. When Metro  
23 took over the total schoolbuilding costs and encouraged  
24 some extra building for the municipal loan funds  
25 undertakings, East York decided to implement at once  
26 a number of recommendations which it would have  
27 implemented solely out of current funds. This quarter  
28 of a million we would not have debentured ourselves.  
29 We are quite willing to have Metro debenture it. We  
30 know we will have to help pay for things other people





1 are debenturing. I would say the City of Toronto  
2 would be more than human if it had not felt it should  
3 get everything it could.

4 I would say that most of the suburban  
5 municipalities have profited financially from the  
6 Metro system. I don't think East York has profited  
7 financially as far as the Council activities are  
8 concerned. I would be prepared to make a case for this.  
9 I think we have from the point of view of the schools  
10 although there are a lot of modifying factors involved,  
11 crossing of boundaries and other difficulties.

12 If Toronto felt it was contributing  
13 more than it was getting to the Metropolitan School  
14 Board funds it would be a great temptation for it to  
15 undertake the replacement of old schools and the  
16 increase of school grants which otherwise it might  
17 not have felt it could afford.

18 I don't believe a good education is  
19 proportionate directly to the amount of money that you  
20 spend on it. We know great people have been educated  
21 in a one room country school house.

22 THE COMMISSIONER: There was a lot left  
23 to learn in those days.

24 MISS DAVIDSON: People made a lot more  
25 effort to learn it. There are still good people  
26 coming from an education of that kind. I don't think  
27 there is any area in Metro probably that does not feel  
28 it has the best educational system. If it has any  
29 decent Home and School Associations and so on it is  
30 bound to feel it has the best system.





1 I know of people who pay to send their  
2 children back to East York when they have moved away.  
3 I think those children would get a better education  
4 because they thought they would. They were doing what  
5 they wanted to do. I would say it is the morale of  
6 the school system and the ambitions of the parents  
7 which determine whether children get a good education  
8 or not. Perhaps we are spending more than we need  
9 to although it is natural to feel nothing is too good  
10 for our children.

11 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very  
12 much, Mrs. Davidson.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





## SUBMISSION OF THE TOWN OF LEASIDE

APPEARANCES: Mayor Beth Nealson  
Mr. Royce Frith, Q.C.

MRS. NEALSON: Mr. Commissioner, I am only going to speak for one minute because Mr. Frith is going to speak to our brief. I would like to say simply that Leaside's only crime in this present Court and in the continuing sessions at the Metro Council would appear to be that we still remain the Utopia municipality within the metropolitan family.

The only criticisms, I think, that have been aimed at Leaside stem from envy rather than the role we have been playing at the Metropolitan Council level.

There was one other thing I would like to personally present as visual evidence of the feeling of the people of Leaside and this is the petition to which we referred in our brief, expressing the people of Leaside's opinion on amalgamation. Over 95% of our voters in the Town of Leaside went on permanent written record as being opposed to it.

Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.

MR. FRITH: Mr. Commissioner, my submissions to you will be under four parts. First I wish to address you on what might be called the fundamental philosophy behind Leaside's approach to Metro and its approach to your work here because I am operating on the assumption, which I know is sound, that you have read the brief carefully.

## The second branch of my representations





1 will deal with a summary of the brief.

2 The third will be certain specific  
3 comments arising out of the brief.

4 Finally, I would like to refer all  
5 of these comments to the Terms of Reference.

6 Now dealing first, Mr. Commissioner,  
7 with our fundamental approach. It is our feeling that  
8 the fundamental issue before you is whether there  
9 is any virtue in bigness and a corresponding vice  
10 in a sort of equality, or inequality, I should say,  
11 of size; whether there is a virtue in tidiness and  
12 in mathematical symmetry and a corresponding vice  
13 in personal human values in a small community if they  
14 interfere with the neatness of that symmetry.

15 In particular we would like to direct  
16 your attention to what we consider to be some of the  
17 fallacies in what might be called the conventional  
18 wisdom in its approach to your work.

19 What is really the virtue in all this  
20 symmetry, the symmetry that is at the foundation of  
21 the proposers of amalgamation and of a borough system?  
22 Is it efficiency?

23 Certainly it looks better on a map.  
24 When you look at a map of Metro now the boundaries  
25 don't look like they were laid out by a tile setter  
26 and it reads better in the various reports that have  
27 been made on this question academically. It reads  
28 better to say, "We will have units that are all roughly  
29 equivalent in size." It appeals to us.

30 We were all taught about the efficiency





1 of the Roman Empire who always had everything organized  
2 in a very careful way. The boundaries were set out.  
3 The populations were set out and a certain man, a  
4 Praetorian had exactly the same influence in Judea  
5 as he had in France or Gaul. There was the division  
6 of Gaul into three parts. All of this is an academically  
7 attractive layout which looks good as a chart on the  
8 wall and looks good in a report.

9 We of an academic background love this  
10 kind of approach to anything. It is the kind of  
11 reasoning that we find very seductive. It makes us  
12 feel comfortable. It sounds sort of knowledgeable  
13 and wise.

14 Of course in fact Metropolitan Toronto  
15 is not boundaries or sewers or roads or hospitals.  
16 It is people. Of course those who propose this nice,  
17 symmetrical, tile-laying approach to Metro will say  
18 that is all right. It is better for the people too.  
19 But how really is it better for the people? How  
20 fundamentally is it better for individual citizens  
21 of Metro, like me and like the others that are here?

22 After all, Democracy is not efficient.  
23 Democracy on a chart on the wall and Democracy in a  
24 report or in a book looks very inefficient. In its  
25 operation it is slow, it is clumsy, it is inefficient  
26 compared to a monolithic structure which looks so good  
27 as a chart on the wall.

28 Why do we keep Democracy? Why would  
29 everyone here, everyone of the 1,651,000 people out  
30 there want to retain Democracy although it is clumsy,





1 slow, and inefficient? It is because it recognizes  
2 human values.

3 To put that in an even less academic  
4 way: Fewer people get hurt. It is a price that we  
5 are prepared to pay. We will pay the price of  
6 inefficiency, pay the price of slowness, in order  
7 not to have to give up the feeling and the belief that  
8 we, as individual people, are protected by the checks  
9 and balances that are involved in this unattractive  
10 system of government, on any other criteria.

11 Now we can say, and there would be  
12 many who would, "Let's not have any of that mush.  
13 Let's get back to sewers and assessments and property  
14 values, and roads, and all these things that the  
15 pros talk about. All the things that the professional  
16 political people talk about, let us talk about those."

17 You will hear that and you have heard  
18 lots about it. In this brief introductory phase,  
19 because it represents our philosophy to the whole  
20 question, Mr. Commissioner, we would like to stick  
21 with people. Now, sticking with people, let us come  
22 face to face with the one apparent, so far apparently  
23 uncontradicted conventional wisdom, that is the need  
24 in Metro of representation by population. Now what in  
25 the context of Metro and your work does that really  
26 mean? Now again it is a theory we all learn in history  
27 books and it is a dandy piece of conventional wisdom.  
28 It will get people nodding their heads the minute you  
29 say it. It is a conditioned reflex.

30 In fact what does it mean here? As a





1 citizen am I going to feel better when I wake up and  
2 realize that I have one 100/1000ths of a representative?  
3 Will I feel better than I did yesterday when I had  
4 one 300/1000ths of a representative? Will I feel  
5 better than my neighbour some distance away who has  
6 one 18/1000ths of a representative?

7 In terms of actual human values we would  
8 ask you to not respond with the conditioned reflex to  
9 this representation by population conventional wisdom  
10 and remember in fact the present system has worked.

11 In this shibboleth I have watched carefully and I have  
12 not heard any citizen of the 1,650,000 say: "I got a  
13 bad deal because I have only one 100/1000ths of a  
14 representative." I have not heard it said: "My sewer  
15 was not fixed because I only had one 100/1000ths or  
16 one 200/1000ths of a representative whereas the other  
17 fellow down the street who had one 1/18000ths of a  
18 representative is getting all the breaks."

19 Not only have I never heard of it  
20 happening but I have never heard any of the pros  
21 suggest that it happened. The fact is the present  
22 system has worked and people have not been hurt. The  
23 system in fact represents community representation,  
24 which has really worked in the life of Metro.

25 The same human values we would ask you  
26 to remember when dealing with the question of boundaries,  
27 which I have already touched on. Look at it apart from  
28 the eye-appeal, from what you might call the tile-setter's  
29 syndrome. Even an imaginative tile setter would not lay  
30 out Metro as has been suggested to you already.





1 Now an ordinary tile setter would  
2 because he would have them all in equal line. He would  
3 order the tile from the building supply men of about  
4 the same size. He would not care whether he cut out  
5 East York.

6 In fact Metro is an interesting mosaic.  
7 As True Davidson says, one of the exciting things about  
8 living in Metropolitan Toronto is the fact that you  
9 have so many choices of the size of community that you  
10 want to live in and you are still a citizen of greater  
11 Metro. You have all the advantages of being a big  
12 city or a big town man or girl and all the advantages  
13 of picking the size that you want.

14 Metro as it now stands has some interest,  
15 some life, some excitement, some fabric, some  
16 imagination in its size. Metro, as it is proposed  
17 by the amalgamationists and the borough proponents has  
18 none. It is a square, geometric and completely  
19 uninteresting, in our respectful views, mosaic.

20 THE COMMISSIONER: It would only change  
21 the boundaries. It would not change the geography of  
22 the area. You would have the ravines and the lake  
23 shores.

24 MR. FRITH: Then why change the boundaries?

25 THE COMMISSIONER: I am not suggesting --

26 MR. FRITH: Mr. Commissioner, I will  
27 give you a rhetorical question for a rhetorical  
28 question. I realize your question is rhetorical but  
29 why change the boundaries? I have heard no justifi-  
30 cation for it except that it is neater and more





1 symmetrical mathematically and the fact it would  
2 create representation by population -- never going  
3 the further step as to exactly why.

4 In our respectful view, Mr. Commissioner,  
5 Metro has been a success. Any government system, no  
6 matter how good it looks on paper, is a failure if  
7 it does not solve the individual human problems.  
8 Leaside does that and because it does that it is a  
9 good working political unit. As Mayor Neilson has  
10 said, in our view it is a model town. In our view  
11 it is a model part of what could become an equally  
12 model metropolitan system.

13 Now, that is the fundamental approach,  
14 Mr. Chairman, behind Leaside's submissions.

15 Now if I may turn to the brief I would  
16 like, Mr. Commissioner, to go through the brief with  
17 you very briefly, highlighting or underlining certain  
18 parts of the brief.

19 In the opening letter from the Mayor  
20 addressed to you, Mr. Commissioner, you will see a very  
21 brief summary of Leaside's history and progress. I  
22 say "brief" as you will notice the Town of Leaside  
23 was incorporated on May 7th, 1913. Of course it is  
24 impossible to synthesize 50 years of history, 50 years  
25 of human living, but without wishing to appear  
26 conceited about this we think that we can honestly say  
27 that the one word that would synthesize Leaside's  
28 history and progress is "success". As a municipal  
29 unit it has been a success.  
30





1 It started as a planned community,  
2 representing the results of a contest, a Canada-wide  
3 contest to select a model community town. The plan  
4 that in fact won and was selected from the many entries  
5 was the plan that was followed and I am sure, Mr.  
6 Commissioner, that you have studied the map, the aerial  
7 photograph and also visited Leaside along with the other  
8 cities or other municipalities that<sup>you</sup> were able to perceive  
9 from the general map of Leaside and from your visits  
10 and from the aerial photograph this plan has been carried  
11 through; and that in fact it has created a zone for  
12 residential and a zone in a way to attract and provide  
13 for large industrial assessment, with the resulting  
14 practically perfect balance between industrial and  
15 residential assessment.

16 This plan has been sort of on the wall  
17 and guided by the Municipal Councils throughout the  
18 fifty year history of this community. This has  
19 resulted in all the theory coming true in living colour.  
20 The balance of assessment has in fact taken place.  
21 This in turn has been reflected in the very sound  
22 financial structure through the years, enabling the  
23 Municipality's administration from time to time to meet  
24 the needs of the residents for schools, recreation  
25 programs, and other municipal services. Too, I think,  
26 we are fair in saying, to an outstandingly successful  
27 degree.

28 This has resulted in our being able to  
29 adopt a pay-as-you-go and repair-and-renew approach  
30 and in every particular, I think we can say without fear





1 of contradiction, that the original 1913 plan developed,  
2 modified and adapted to the changing times has produced  
3 a community which represents the reality of perfection  
4 in all of the things that technically municipalities  
5 should be and in terms of human values.

6           You will recall, from reading the brief,  
7 Mr. Commissioner, that the first section of the brief  
8 or the next section of the brief contains really general  
9 information relating to Leaside and attempts to assist  
10 you, as a Commissioner, to relate your other readings on  
11 the subject, your personal visits to the community and  
12 to other studies, to relate that and give you background  
13 material and detail as to what Leaside is like because,  
14 of course, the task before you is a formidable one in  
15 terms of absorbing the history, the wharf and woof and  
16 fabric of this community and of the communities that make  
17 it up.

18           You will notice we have also included  
19 pictures to help you see what we are talking about and  
20 we are, of course, particularly proud of our Community  
21 Centre, which is referred to on page 7 - not simply  
22 because it is physically attractive and a successful  
23 enterprise but because it reflects the kind of thing  
24 that a well designed community can stimulate in the  
25 residents of the community. It is unsubsidized, self  
26 operating and self perpetuating and supporting community  
27 service consisting of gardens, an auditorium, swimming  
28 pool, curling rink, along with lawn bowling<sup>and</sup>/has all the  
29 physical things that reflect the community spirit and  
30 community consciousness that exists in Leaside.





1                   You will recall also we referred to  
2 another important community feature and that is our  
3 library of which we have included some pictures in case  
4 you are unable to get out to visit us.

5                   We have a section on the health unit. We  
6 support the view that fire is a community service and we  
7 have given you some background in terms of facts includ-  
8 ing pictures.

9                   The residential nature of the Town is  
10 shown to you too in some pictures. We are proud of  
11 the fact that Leaside formed the first Safety Council  
12 in the area and has resulted, as pointed out to you, in  
13 a really remarkable history of accident-free living.  
14 Of course, this Safety Council reflects community  
15 activity since it is run entirely by volunteer citizens.

16                   On planning, we show you some pictures in  
17 connection with that and education and our schools. You  
18 will hear more about that from others.

19                   Then we give you some facts again, Mr.  
20 Commissioner, which we hope will assist you in the  
21 problem of educational split of capital values and  
22 current requirements.

23                   We show you a breakdown of Leaside's tax  
24 dollar and how it is spent. We think this also reflects  
25 the value and advantage that has come through careful  
26 planning over this fifty-year period.

27                   We would like you to underline, if you  
28 have not already done so, the bottom of page 4 which  
29 sets out Leaside's assessment of \$76,282,618.00. I say  
30 that because I think that a very useful yardstick was





1 given to you by Reeve MacBeth when he pointed out that  
2 there is in an area of the type we are talking about  
3 another yardstick for representation and that is the  
4 yardstick of assessment - that is for representation and  
5 size, and that population is not the only criterion  
6 for deciding the appropriate or perfect or optimum size  
7 for a community.

8 Also, we would hope that you would circle  
9 our percentage of debenture debt to assessment, which is  
10 only four per cent.

11 In our submission, Mr. Commissioner, we  
12 hope we reflect some of the views and I express this  
13 fundamental philosophy to our approach to Metro and to  
14 the problem before this Commission. It is our feeling,  
15 as outlined on page 27, that political communities  
16 develop for other than symmetrical form of boundary or  
17 symmetry of boundaries reasons and that the particular  
18 attractiveness of Metro is its lack of perfect symmetry  
19 in terms of size and that the citizens have this  
20 opportunity to choose the size of community and the type  
21 of community they would like to live in while still be-  
22 ing a member of the larger community.

23 We feel that the set-up of the Metropolitan  
24 Toronto form of government and its ten-year history of  
25 progress has benefitted the overall area and that  
26 Leaside has made its contribution. We believe the  
27 basic principles of Metropolitan Toronto are sound and  
28 do serve the best needs of the area but, Mr. Commissioner  
29 we agree - in case we are creating the impression we do  
30 not see any reason for you being here - we agree that





1 there must be a re-assessment of the financial problems  
2 which can and will be solved within the concept of the  
3 Metropolitan Government. After all, Canada itself  
4 operates successfully - though sometimes under strain -  
5 under a federal system. Provinces of varying size,  
6 wealth and customs attend to their own local problems  
7 and solve national problems, under the system of co-  
8 operative federalism. I put that phrase forward  
9 in a non-partisan sense. This is the system----

10 THE COMMISSIONER: My program says this  
11 is only very recently.

12 MR. FRITH: This is the system of our  
13 Constitution, the British North America Act.

14 It is not perfect - and here I think the  
15 analogy is complete - it is perfect but it works.

16 Unification and centralization do not have  
17 the automatic value their proposers espouse, and I give  
18 you two examples which you will recall from reading the  
19 brief.

20 We feel, Mr. Commissioner, that the  
21 objective is to retain the greatest possible degree of  
22 self-government and provide necessary services to the  
23 people of Metropolitan Toronto on a sound economical  
24 basis, that that degree of self-government can best be  
25 attained by a retention of the thirteen area municipal  
26 councils, administering these services that are local  
27 services. For example, recreation, fire-fighting,  
28 library service, Safety Council, planning.

29 The Council submits that greater advantage  
30 to the recipient accrues when certain services are ad-





1 ministered, or administered and finances, at the local  
2 level.

3 Now, Mr. Commissioner, I have a feeling I  
4 do not need to underline the first example that we give  
5 of community service, and that is recreation.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: It is very well stated  
7 actually in the brief.

8 MR. FRITH: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.  
9 I only want to underline one aspect of it and that is  
10 among the pros, if I can use that expression, we do tend  
11 to think of recreation as a sort of minor subject that is,  
12 it is our tendency because of our more or less inside  
13 approach to politics and government that we are thinking  
14 in terms of things like sewers and sidewalks and capital  
15 questions and allocation of costs and so on as  
16 really of greater importance. We tend to feel that  
17 recreation is a sort of a manifest thing, it is built-in.  
18 Let us get back to something we can talk about in terms  
19 of columns of figures and so on.

20 In fact, we urge you, Mr. Commissioner,  
21 to look at this question. It is vital. It is an  
22 absolutely vital part of enjoying life at a particular  
23 community. We feel that we can be justifiably proud of  
24 a really remarkable recreation service which we feel,  
25 for reasons we point out in the brief would be completely  
26 sacrificed if they were taken and put into something  
27 that was less personal and less community orientated  
28 than it is at the present time.

29 We have outlined, Mr. Commissioner, for  
30 you our feelings on libraries. This is in exactly the





1 same category. The people of Leaside have a library  
2 service that is not only adequate but of a calibre that  
3 encourages greater use of its facilities.

4 We have taken the opportunity of giving some facts  
5 about the library together with some pictures, as I  
6 have already mentioned.

7 You will recall the reasons that Etobicoke  
8 has outlined in their brief that fire protection is a  
9 community service, Mr. Commissioner. We are simply  
10 submitting that that is so. I would draw your attention  
11 to the fact in our brief we agree with that and we point  
12 out it is our opinion that fire protection should be  
13 retained as a local service for the following reasons:

14 (a) The Leaside Fire Department is efficient  
15 and affords a high degree of protection to the  
16 people of Leaside. The Department has received  
17 many awards of merit.

18 (b) The cost of this protection is in keeping  
19 with the high standard of service provided  
20 and the type of service required in our kind  
21 of municipality.

22 (c) The below-average fire loss experienced  
23 in Leaside attests to the Department's ef-  
24 ficiency:- and we show that in figures over  
25 a ten year period.

26 (d) One of the reasons for the outstanding  
27 efficiency of the Leaside Fire Department is  
28 the esprit des corps and pride in the local  
29 organization. The community spirit would  
30 be lost if it were merged.





1 (e) Fire protection is essentially a local  
2 matter and co-operation between Fire  
3 Departments of adjoining municipalities  
4 solves any problem requiring such  
5 co-operation. The strongest justifi-  
6 cation for the continuation of the present  
7 system is the fact that it works.

8 Now then, I would like to say one thing  
9 on planning which we feel is also a community matter.  
10 Miss Davidson, I thought, outlined from a strictly  
11 personal point of view and I thought from a very  
12 eloquent point of view as a Member of the Metropolitan  
13 Planning Board why she feels that it should be a com-  
14 munity service. I would also like to underline what  
15 we mentioned in the brief, Mr. Commissioner, and that  
16 is that the philosophy of the Planning Act in Ontario  
17 is a philosophy that says not only that planning  
18 should be done at the local stage but, if you recall  
19 ever reading the Act, it is readily apparent from the  
20 words of the Statute that its basis is encouraging  
21 participation by the members of the community. You  
22 will recall such sections as the ones that direct the  
23 Planning Board to have hearings and the Department  
24 itself is only sending out material and helping them  
25 organize meetings. The whole objective in planning is  
26 to make people not simply accept planning and sort of  
27 share it but to get them to fully participate in the  
28 actual planning process, but if the fundamental  
29 philosophy of the Act is that the community should  
30 plan its own future, amalgamation of the Metropolitan





1 Toronto Planning Board would, in fact, repeal the  
2 basis of the Planning Act, as far as Metropolitan Toronto  
3 is concerned because Metropolitan Toronto is, in fact,  
4 bigger than many provinces. One Planning Board for  
5 Metropolitan Toronto would have no closer connection  
6 with individual community needs than a Provincial  
7 Planning Board would have, and it is contrary to the  
8 intention of the Provincial Planning Act.

9 Participation - and this is the key  
10 phrase which we would underline for you, Mr. Commissioner  
11 - the participation of the individual citizen in the  
12 Planning process is absolutely vital and he will not  
13 participate unless he sees himself in a community small  
14 enough to feel his influence.

15 Mr. Commissioner, we also outline safety  
16 as a community service. Welfare, we consider, is a  
17 community service. Housing, we consider a Metropolitan  
18 service, dealing with such things as Homes for the Aged,  
19 accommodation for Senior Citizens and so on.

20 Hospitals, we say, are a Metropolitan  
21 service. Public Transportation is a Metropolitan  
22 service.

23 Those are some of the examples and we  
24 hope we reflect, Mr. Chairman, our feeling that any  
25 adjustments that are required can be adjustments  
26 within the present Metropolitan structure.

27 These conclusions are reflected in the  
28 comments on page 41 where we point out that the  
29 Metropolitan Toronto Corporation as presently constituted  
30 has the power to take care of inequity costs. If certain





1 member communities of Metropolitan Toronto are felt -  
2 and we feel perhaps some might allege this against us -  
3 not to be paying their proper share, the question is,  
4 what are those costs?

5 We would ask those appearing before you,  
6 we publicly ask them to say if there are costs that they  
7 feel Leaside is not properly bearing or equitably  
8 bearing because Leaside is prepared to support appropri-  
9 ate financial adjustments in order to lessen the in-  
10 equality. Amalgamation would only pyramid existing  
11 problems and bring the present progressive improvement  
12 in standards of service to a standstill; and result in  
13 greater costs for no gain.

14 As we have mentioned, we feel the urgency  
15 of need within Metro has shifted from the physical  
16 to the socially orientated. The immediate need for  
17 action is in this area; housing, hospitals, planning  
18 and community welfare generally, recreation, libraries.  
19 It is our feeling that the Metropolitan system can  
20 operate quite flexibly and lay the responsibility in  
21 these fields in the Metropolitan area where it belongs  
22 and in the local area where it belongs. The emphasis  
23 must shift from the needs of the total community to the  
24 consideration of the individual within that community,  
25 because it is with the expressways and the trunk sewers  
26 that Metro has been successful, in our view and in those  
27 physical areas it did solve a real problem and we needed  
28 Metro so there can be no question we are not suggesting  
29 we did not. Metro has done good things for Leaside  
30 and that is one of the reasons we want it retained.





We feel the present economical imbalance can be adjusted within the present terms of reference of the Metropolitan Toronto Act. We feel that one of the things that is needed, and this is on this question of the split that was referred to, Mr. Commissioner, between the City and the suburbs - we feel that what is needed - and this is something that you cannot do, Mr. Commissioner, and it would be unreal of any of us to come before you and expect you to do - what we think is an important thing, namely as we mention here, the re-orientation of the attitudes of elected officials to the task of representing the interests of all the individuals in the Metropolitan community - a dedication to making the present formula of government work - but more equitably.

Fundamentally when it is not necessary to change, it is necessary not to change, not a change of form but a change of attitudes would go a long way to solving some of the problems you have pinpointed this morning.

We feel this should be done one by one and re-organized with a massive community attack on these from all angles.

—

—





1 THE COMMISSIONER: You say that the  
2 present economic imbalance can be adjusted within the  
3 present terms of reference of the Act, but you make no  
4 particular suggestions as to how it might be done.

5 MR. FRITH: Fundamentally, Mr. Commissioner,  
6 we feel that we have paid our proper share but we  
7 recognize the fact that with some of this imbalance  
8 which existed, particularly as between other municipali-  
9 ties, they may feel we have not. All we are saying  
10 is inviting them to tell us any imbalance that they  
11 think Leaside should participate in by paying more,  
12 because it is a price that we are prepared to pay for  
13 our fundamental desire to retain our community and to  
14 retain not just our community for ourselves but to  
15 retain what our community represents in the overall  
16 Metropolitan Toronto mosaic.

17 If there are ways for example that some  
18 adjustments of assessment have to be made in order to  
19 be equitable, as long as these are fair and reasonable  
20 requirements - in other words if there is some  
21 situation in which it could be demonstrated that a  
22 citizen of Leaside is in fact not paying his fair  
23 share - then we say do not kill the patient with the  
24 cure; adjust; come up with a recommendation as to how  
25 you think we should be paying more.

26 But because there are some economic im-  
27 balances do not wipe out all the present boundaries,  
28 wipe out all the present community identity and pay  
29 that price for something that could be accomplished  
30 with much less surgery.





1 I have listened here to where the imbalances  
2 are. No one has made any specific allegations against us,  
3 but because we are facing the proponents of the borough  
4 system or of amalgamation, who must necessarily swallow  
5 us up, we are really here simply to say what is your  
6 justification for it? Where do you say we are not  
7 paying our share under this present system?

8 THE COMMISSIONER: In the brief which Miss  
9 Davidson presented this morning on behalf of East York  
10 the reference is made to a suggestion by a Councillor  
11 that commercial and industrial taxation be transferred  
12 to Metro to finance Metro functions leaving residential  
13 assessment to finance local matters within the  
14 jurisdiction of the area municipalities. Have you any-  
15 thing to say about that?

16 MR. FRITH: Yes. I would say that is  
17 definitely pretty heavy surgery.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: She was not talking  
19 for Leaside, of course.

20 MR. FRITH: No, I am sure of that, Mr.  
21 Commissioner. Of course the fifty years of planning  
22 that have resulted in a good industrial and residential  
23 assessment plan in Leaside is exactly what is then going  
24 to be taken away. But the key thing, as we all realize,  
25 is the reason some of the big municipalities are in  
26 trouble.

27 One of the reasons and probably the most  
28 basic reason is the fact that they have had this kind  
29 of development where residential development has had to  
30 carry, for example, the cost of education, which is the





1 biggest cost we are all facing. The fact is that the  
2 reason a balance of industrial and residential is so  
3 valuable is that industry pays taxes to support schools  
4 and does not send children to school. The other is,  
5 of course, a tightening noose. As you build residential  
6 areas you have to build schools to serve them and they  
7 have to carry that whole big weight on their backs.

8 That is the kind of adjustment which is not  
9 what I would call an adjustment. That is not the  
10 delicate kind of surgery I had in mind; that is more or  
11 less a decapitation.

12 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want to say  
13 something, Mayor Neelson?

14 MAYOR BETH NEALSON: Yes. If I may en-  
15 large on this point of willingness to adjust big  
16 financial assessments, I feel that back in 1963 Leaside  
17 Council, whom I represented on Metropolitan Council, is  
18 actively supporting this, at the present time. In 1962  
19 Metropolitan Council requested the Province to make  
20 mandatory welfare services a Metropolitan responsibility.

21 THE COMMISSIONER: A Metropolitan finan-  
22 cial responsibility?

23 MAYOR NEALSON: Well, totally. Early in  
24 1963 the suburban heads on Metropolitan went to Queen's  
25 Park with a brief suggesting that the administration  
26 remain locally so the recipient would have the maximum  
27 benefit, but that the financial basis be reallocated.  
28 The Province in its wisdom saw fit then to assist twenty  
29 per cent which the Province does not assume against  
30 Metropolitan Toronto.





1                   Of course more recently I have supported  
2 Metropolitan Toronto's re-entry into grants for hospitals  
3 and I would like to go on record here that I really do  
4 not feel that hospital construction costs are the  
5 responsibility of any municipality. I think this is a  
6 responsibility that should be accepted and discharged by  
7 the Province. But I feel that Metropolitan Toronto  
8 was forced into this area by the critical shortage that  
9 exists at the moment. If there is a need for municipal  
10 grants, then these in my opinion should be Metropolitan  
11 municipal grants and not area grants.

12                   The next adjustment was in the assumption  
13 by Metropolitan Government of the capital construction  
14 costs and the acquisition of sites for all schools in  
15 the Metropolitan area - which Leaside Council, through  
16 myself, wholeheartedly supported.

17                   The more recent one was the change brought  
18 into Metropolitan Executive by the Metropolitan School  
19 Board for the re-adjustment in the maintenance assistance  
20 payments, and this I supported because this is the kind  
21 of thing and the kind of area in which Leaside is willing  
22 to compromise on a financial basis in order to retain  
23 some degree of local autonomy and, most of all, our  
24 identity as a community.

25                   I just wanted to clarify that.

26                   MR. FRITH: Naturally, Mr. Commissioner, I  
27 would welcome any other questions. The other members of  
28 Council are also here and any of us can answer them for  
29 you.

30                   Well then, you will recall, Mr. Commissioner,





1 that we were just closing our summary, our highlight  
2 tour through the brief. In connection with our con-  
3 clusions we feel, as I have mentioned to you, that the  
4 representation problem is an artificial one. The fact  
5 is that the present system as far as representation is  
6 concerned has worked. At no time has a municipality  
7 suffered as a result of any lack of representation. We  
8 welcome you to examine the advantages to all in cost  
9 and efficiency in retaining the present system.

10 If this is done we feel that Metropolitan  
11 Toronto's greatest asset is that flexible self-determin-  
12 ation would preserve desirable local autonomy and avoid  
13 increased burdens of cost, red tape and as well the  
14 inevitable cumbersomeness and inefficiency that goes  
15 with expansion of centralization.

16 That concludes the second of my submissions  
17 to you. I did want simply to make a few brief comments  
18 arising out of the brief and the general comments that I  
19 have made.

20 As it is probably apparent to you, we feel  
21 there is nothing seriously wrong with Metro as it stands  
22 and that in its flexible form it can permit the urban  
23 area to grow without sacrificing individual autonomy.  
24 We feel the burden should be taken as a very heavy  
25 burden on those who want to change it - the amalgamation-  
26 ists or boroughists, if we can call them that.

27 It is our respectful view that in your  
28 approach to this problem, Mr. Commissioner, if the facts  
29 persuade<sup>you</sup>/as they have persuaded us - that in general  
30 Metro has worked very well - then the examination of the





1 foundations for change of that system should be a careful  
2 and a meticulous one and one which in effect represents  
3 a placing of a heavy onus on those who want to change the  
4 fundamental system, as distinguished from those who say  
5 that there are the following adjustments that should be  
6 made within the present system.

7           We feel that a perfect example of the  
8 flexibility of self-determination even in boundaries  
9 is the fact that some of the municipalities want to join.  
10 The Lakeshore municipalities have from time to time -  
11 or some of them have indicated they would like to join  
12 with another municipality, and of course this makes sense.  
13 If they themselves want that, then it is that part of the  
14 flexible self-determination that exists in Metro that is  
15 a part of, really an important part of the lubricant  
16 that makes the organism work - this flexibility and  
17 these differences in size. That is why we urge you,  
18 Mr. Commissioner, not to remove that part of the organism.

19           The differences in size again is reflected  
20 in this possibility of even changing their own boundaries  
21 themselves - not imposing just useful, symmetrical -  
22 or apparently symmetrical - boundaries on them.

23           We would ask you, Mr. Commissioner, (as we  
24 are sure you will) to really question the objectives of  
25 those who want to change these important human values  
26 and present characteristics. Apart from increased  
27 centralization of power - which in our respectful view  
28 is always a dangerous thing and always something that  
29 should be resisted in our form of government, a central-  
30 ization and a gathering together of power, for the simple





1 reason that history has taught all of us that excessive  
2 power in one place is a dangerous thing for the community.

3 Apart from increased centralization of  
4 power and a sort of captivation with the alleged  
5 simplicity of the amalgamation or the borough system,  
6 we feel that there can only be that complaint against  
7 Leaside that we have referred to - and that is the  
8 feeling that we are not paying our proper share of  
9 certain just and proper charges; and again we ask that  
10 question of what the area is, and if there are those  
11 that feel we are not we would like to hear what they  
12 are.....

13 Again we have asked you, Mr. Commissioner,  
14 to question the conventional wisdoms, including this  
15 question of size. As Miss Davidson says, she was  
16 trying to find the appropriate size - the appropriate  
17 size, she says, sufficient to provide services. In our  
18 respectful view it is a fallacy to approach the question  
19 that way. We are not starting from scratch. We do  
20 not have a great field of waving wheat that we are  
21 going to cut down and build a city.

22 The fact is that for example these  
23 communities including Leaside at its present size with  
24 its present assessment and present balance of assessment,  
25 do provide the services within the Metro context.

26 I would make one reference - more or less a  
27 lawyer-like reference - to just what in fact the cost to  
28 Leaside is or would be in a borough system. In the  
29 Gathercole Report you will find it, and I am sure you  
30 have studied it. In any event I would ask you to note





1 that the higher price to be paid would be paid by  
2 Leaside in either of the borough or amalgamated forms.  
3 Under amalgamation it would \$14.19 per thousand of  
4 assessment against, for example, \$1.00 for Toronto. It  
5 would be \$14.63 in the five-borough system and \$14.56  
6 under the four-borough system as against 63¢, for  
7 example, for Toronto.

8 That is not a fundamental reason, but it is  
9 a point that we would like you to take into account in  
10 considering our views.

11 Finally, Mr. Commissioner, to come to the  
12 last part of my submissions, the specific terms of  
13 reference refer to the structure and organization of  
14 the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and more  
15 particularly of the Metropolitan Council. Our  
16 fundamental position on that is that the structure and  
17 organization of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto  
18 and of the Council, as regards this your report, in  
19 our respectful view, should say that fundamentally it  
20 has been a success and fundamentally it should not be  
21 changed.

22 Reference term B: the purpose and  
23 objectives of the establishment of the Metropolitan  
24 Corporation and the Metropolitan School Board and the  
25 extent of the implementation of such objectives - I  
26 would say very much better than a passing grade. In  
27 fact honours should be in essence the finding there.

28 And we ask you again - although I realize  
29 I am repeating myself - to recognize what is in our  
30 respectful view the true and important character of





1 Metro, and that is the existence of units of different  
2 sizes in making it work as a unity; the boundaries of  
3 the Metropolitan area and of the area municipalities  
4 and their suitability in the light of the experience  
5 gained.

6 Again we say that Metro's success is very  
7 largely related to the fact that it does not have  
8 artificial equal communities in size but that it has  
9 communities of different sizes.

10 "Any related matters affecting" - what  
11 can I say about that? As you say, Mr. Commissioner,  
12 your terms of reference include almost everything.

13 Really, Mr. Commissioner, when we think  
14 about it who is really concerned? Is it not possible  
15 that in approaching the solution to these problems -  
16 and, of course, as a member of the Metropolitan community  
17 we welcome the contribution (I say this with respect  
18 and not wishing to be presumptuous) we welcome the con-  
19 tribution that your many years of success in solving  
20 problems of this kind can bring to the solution of Metro's  
21 problems.

22  
23  
24 -  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 -  
30





1 Is it not possible that in doing that,  
2 Mr. Commissioner, you should remember that the people  
3 that are concerned might be too excessively pros.  
4 There are 1,650,000 people out there and where are  
5 they?

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You are talking for  
7 18,000.

8 MR. FRITH: That is right and there  
9 they are. That is what they think.

10 It is an interesting thing, and I draw  
11 it to your attention, Mr. Commissioner, my experience  
12 politically is the thing that gets people to come out  
13 to meetings are negative feelings. In other words,  
14 if in terms of human values, in terms of real human  
15 values Metro has not worked, all this system including  
16 the boundaries, representation to Council, all the  
17 things in the Terms of Reference, if it has not worked  
18 would not our experience as human beings indicate that  
19 this place, that these hearings should be held perhaps  
20 in Maple Leaf Gardens.

21 In fact practically all of us here are  
22 pros in a sense. Now that does not mean there is  
23 anything wrong but I think it is a fact you can  
24 properly take into account. It is not just the paper  
25 and the facts and the suggestions, and not just the  
26 reports that are made to you, but the response of the  
27 community. I think it is something reasonable and  
28 proper for you to take into account when you report  
29 and say how, Mr. Commissioner, did you find this  
30 organism and that one of the symptoms that you should





1 note in your diagnosis is the fact you did not find  
2 a mob of angry residents saying that Metro was not  
3 doing a job for them, and Metro as it exists right  
4 now, because that mob is not here.

5           The only reason I underline that, Mr.  
6 Commissioner, is because we feel so strongly that these  
7 human values should far outweigh the other questions  
8 which in our view are questions of adjustment. We  
9 feel if it is looked at in that way we can continue  
10 to enjoy being residents of one of the smaller  
11 communities and perhaps if we want to we can join  
12 one of the bigger communities as a citizen, but we  
13 can continue enjoying Metro as it now is, a wonderful  
14 place to live. Thank you.

15           THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. I have  
16 no further questions, Mr. Frith. I am going to  
17 adjourn now until two o'clock.

18 ---THE HEARING WAS ADJOURNED AT 1:10 P.M. TO BE  
19 RESUMED AT 2:00 P.M.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30





1 ---UPON RESUMING AT 2:00 P.M.

2  
3 SUBMISSION OF THE CORPORATION OF THE VILLAGE  
4 OF FOREST HILL

5 APPEARANCES: Reeve Edwin J. Pivnick  
6 Deputy Reeve Frank M. Sommerville  
7 Councillor Sidney H. Banks  
8 Councillor Donald H. Milnes  
9 Councillor Norman M. Simpson  
10 Mr. T. Ragnar Johnson, Solicitor  
11 Mr. Harold Parkinson, Works Commissioner  
12 Mr. Ivan Coronsberry, Clerk Treasurer

13 MR. PIVNICK: Mr. Commissioner, before  
14 beginning may I first present to you the members of  
15 the Forest Hill Council. There is Councillor Norman  
16 Simpson, Deputy Reeve Frank Sommerville, Councillor  
17 Donald Milnes. We also have with us Mr. Ragnar Johnson,  
18 the Solicitor for Forest Hill and the Works Commissioner,  
19 Mr. Harold Parkinson. Mr. Ivan Coronsberry, the  
20 Clerk Treasurer is with us also.

21 Sir, I have the honour to present to  
22 you, as the spokesman of Council and accordingly as  
23 the spokesman of the representatives of the community  
24 of the Village of Forest Hill, formally the brief  
25 which you undoubtedly have read.

26 The first reference that the brief  
27 contains in the opening pages is simply to give a very  
28 short indication of the nature of the community as  
29 seen from the eyes of someone writing an historical  
30 review.

31 The community as such was incorporated  
32 on or about January 1st, 1924 as a residential  
33 community and has to a very large extent maintained  
34 its character over the years.





1 Secondly, we quote with approval the  
2 important statements made by the Prime Minister in  
3 the House at the time the Municipality of Metropolitan  
4 Toronto Amendment Act of 1963 was introduced.

5 This then takes us over to page 5 where  
6 the brief itself starts. Our first comment there  
7 is that we endorse and support the action of the  
8 Lieutenant Governor-in-Council in appointing the Royal  
9 Commission on Metropolitan Toronto on June 20th, 1963.

10 We do this, sir, not only for the  
11 necessary support that a responsible Council ought  
12 to give to a responsible Municipal Council to an  
13 important action of the Provincial Government in  
14 this regard and in addition to the normal courtesy  
15 which you as a Royal Commissioner deserve to expect.  
16 We do it because we believe that this is the best way  
17 in which this difficult and controversial question  
18 can be handled.

19 By way of illustrating this, on February  
20 21st, 1963 the Council enacted a resolution which we  
21 sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in which we  
22 requested that amendments be made to the Municipal Act,  
23 the Metropolitan Toronto Act, which would have the  
24 effect of taking away from the Municipal Board the  
25 various applications which then were being handled  
26 by the Board.

27 We would not have felt the same way if  
28 the Board had been handling the matter by way of  
29 reference, as the Act permits, in the same way that  
30 the Supreme Court of Canada may have a reference from





1 the Federal Parliament, but in the end we think that  
2 the right thing was done. There was a Bill introduced  
3 on the 15th day of April, 1963 making the change and  
4 the Commission was appointed.

5 You will see that our support of the  
6 Commission and its findings will, as I say, transcend  
7 the normal courtesies that might be expected. We think  
8 it is the right way to do it.

9 At the bottom of page 5 we state what  
10 we consider to be the fundamental inquiry, or purpose  
11 of the inquiry, the heart of the inquiry. We hope  
12 you don't feel it impertinent of us to point to the  
13 matter in that way. We say that we think that the  
14 heart of the present inquiry is to decide upon or  
15 devise the political unit or units, or the governmental  
16 machinery, which will, with a minimum of duplication of  
17 effort and expense, retain a maximum of worthwhile  
18 political traditions and human and sociological  
19 values and result in the greatest good for the most  
20 people for the longest time.

21 One additional reason that we had for  
22 supporting this method of trying to answer that result  
23 was that we caused a letter to be sent to the  
24 community in the summer of 1963, on or about August 9th  
25 or 10th, in which we set out the Terms of Reference  
26 to the Royal Commissioner and stated in this letter  
27 that it is the opinion of your Council that the  
28 recommendations of the Commissioner will be given  
29 considerable weight by the Provincial Government and  
30 may result in important changes being made in the





1 Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

2 Now we did receive replies to this  
3 letter, fewer than we had expected. We are not able  
4 to really assist the Commissioner by presenting any  
5 preponderant view that was disclosed by these letters.  
6 Of course, they are available to you if they are of  
7 any interest. It did seem to point up the fact that  
8 the average citizen of the area perhaps does not fully  
9 comprehend the variety and complexity of the matters  
10 which are dealt with by Municipal Government and which  
11 have to be dealt with by this Commission.

12 The brief then goes on to state that  
13 we have made no effort to assemble together and  
14 analyze statistical material which we have no doubt  
15 will have been exhaustively reviewed by you and your  
16 staff. We have attempted to confine ourselves in the  
17 brief to some broad questions and to make some general  
18 comments on these questions based on Forest Hill's  
19 experience.

20 We want to make it very clear, and we  
21 so state in our brief, that nothing that we say is  
22 motivated by any desire to maintain the status quo  
23 as such, nor to perpetuate this Council in public  
24 office. We do genuinely wish to assist the Commissioner  
25 in presenting the view of an important community that  
26 has existed in this area since 1924 without saying  
27 that as such the status quo must be maintained.

28 On the other hand, we feel that in taking  
29 that approach, if I may put it this way, we, on behalf  
30 of the community, expect that the most open-minded





1 approach can be taken and will be taken to the important  
2 questions without self-imposed limitations arising  
3 from what may be said to be practical and political  
4 expediency and which may be urged upon you by others  
5 who appear before you.

6 We, for example, mention in the brief that  
7 we expect this will not be the kind of limitation that  
8 was imposed on the Gathercole Report whereby it was  
9 really a fact-finding report to establish the financial  
10 positions of area municipalities.

11 We think it was important that one of  
12 your terms of reference included the obligation or  
13 the right to look beyond the boundaries of the present  
14 Metro area. We respectfully suggest that you should  
15 make that an important part of your inquiry.

16 THE COMMISSIONER: Do I understand that  
17 your criticism of the limitations imposed, as you say  
18 here, on the Gathercole Report is that that limitation  
19 was financially exclusive?

20 MR. PIVNICK: That was one thing, sir.  
21 Part of the same answer was this: As I recall, the  
22 Gathercole Report at page 1 of the report, right at  
23 the outset, set forth the limitation which was that  
24 the inquiry was directed towards finding the financial  
25 impact if you had one of three alternatives: An  
26 amalgamated area, a four-borough system, or a five-  
27 borough system.

28 If one were to pick up the brief and  
29 look at the last page at the conclusions, we would not  
30 conclude there is anything terribly helpful to be





1 received in the conclusion there should be a four or  
2 five-borough system. Presumably there has been no  
3 consideration given either to the financial impact  
4 on a many more borough system or to other matters  
5 other than the financial impact.

6 This is the point I was trying to make.  
7 We consider that to be a serious limitation and no  
8 way to approach the matter. We are certain that a  
9 much broader view of the problem will be taken at this  
10 hearing. As I say, one of the things that we do  
11 respectfully say should be looked at quite fully is  
12 the area beyond the existing municipal boundaries,  
13 which is, of course, one of the Terms of Reference to  
14 you.

15 Having said as sincerely as I can, we  
16 do not argue for the status quo as such and that we  
17 have no thought in mind of perpetuating ourselves  
18 in public office, we do say on page 8 and we say in  
19 strong terms, seeing it as we do, a kind of  
20 necessary obligation to the present community from  
21 the many members of the community who have the view  
22 that they wish to retain the community in its present  
23 form, there is then a very real obligation to the  
24 residents of a long-settled municipality, making a  
25 proper contribution to the Metropolitan System, to  
26 ensure that if a change is being made in the form of  
27 government of municipal structure to which they have  
28 been accustomed and which appears to be functioning  
29 properly, it is made only after a full and searching  
30 consideration has been given to all factors and all





1 possible alternatives, and indeed no change in the  
2 status of such a community should be made or can be  
3 justified unless the inevitable conclusion, on an  
4 overwhelming preponderance of evidence, is that  
5 such change is required and is an improvement.

6 The kind of things we say, sir, is the  
7 one that is referred to at page 8 in the Cumming Report  
8 where, in dealing with an application that the Board  
9 then had before it, the Board said that in its opinion  
10 the applicants must, in the first place, satisfy the Board  
11 that the existing system is so inadequate to serve the  
12 essential needs of the area that some drastic type of  
reform is clearly necessary.

13 I won't take up your time reviewing  
14 the rest of the paragraph, which is somewhat short,  
15 but I do respectfully draw your attention to that  
16 paragraph again.

17 When we talk here of making a proper  
18 contribution to the Metropolitan System, the kind  
19 of thing we have in mind is this: Your statistical  
20 review will, I believe, disclose that in terms of  
21 the flow of dollars as between Forest Hill Village  
22 and the Metropolitan System, the flow has been in  
23 the direction away from Forest Hill and into the  
24 Metropolitan Corporation to a considerable extent.  
25 We do not complain about that. We think this is a  
26 proper thing. We think that this is part of the  
27 Metropolitan concept, that in the balance of needs  
28 and services that there will be some who will be  
29 receiving more from the Metropolitan Corporation than  
30 they contribute and others who may be giving more than





1 they receive; but I think it is important to know  
2 that this has been the position and is the position  
3 today of Forest Hill Village.

4 A tour of the Municipality would  
5 disclose that our schools are far from the most modern  
6 in their physical plant. On the contrary they are --  
7 perhaps it might surprise you to see -- in some  
8 instances where there is probably not a school that  
9 would compare in some of the suburbs, the more  
10 distant suburbs, in antiquity of plant and it is not  
11 solely because of any age itself in the Municipality,  
12 but because there has been a continuing effort not to  
13 go to the Metropolitan Corporation and to debenture  
14 other than for most essential needs.

15 Another illustration of this is that  
16 you will find a new municipal building and library  
17 was built very recently. It was opened at the end  
18 of 1962 and this building was paid for entirely from  
19 Forest Hill funds. There was no debenturing done.

20 Again, we only offer this by way of  
21 explanation of what we have in mind when we say making  
22 a proper contribution to the Metropolitan System.  
23 Those funds which could have been diverted to lowering  
24 the tax rate, with a Council taking a narrower view,  
25 who might have said, "Let's debenture it". There is  
26 no question in our minds but that Metro would have  
27 approved it because we have gone to them on so few  
28 occasions for funds. Instead of doing this we felt  
29 it was proper to pay for it ourselves and not incur  
30 this extra charge through Metro debentures on the





1 remaining area municipalities.

2 Another example is an action that was  
3 taken by Council just some weeks ago, when having  
4 been circulated with a letter from the Metropolitan  
5 Corporation indicating that the Lakeshore Municipalities  
6 would be appearing before the Executive Committee  
7 to discuss a single fare TTC zone, the Council of the  
8 Village of Forest Hill, having been invited to do so  
9 as were all other area municipalities, attended the  
10 meeting to appear before the Executive and stated that  
11 in our opinion that was a desirable objective -- that  
12 while there was some short term and immediate financial  
13 problems that would be involved, it was a desirable  
14 objective to try and accomplish as soon as possible,  
15 one fare for the TTC in the whole Metropolitan area.  
16 Now, in the narrower sense this could do nothing in  
17 fact but harm the residents of the Village of Forest  
18 Hill in the sense of it being more costly. They are  
19 now in a one fare zone. There would be no gain in  
20 the narrower sense from their point of view but  
21 nevertheless the Village Council, thinking that this  
22 was desirable and constructive, appeared to say so  
23 to the meeting.

24 This is another example of the kind of  
25 thing we mean about making a contribution to the  
26 Metropolitan System, a proper contribution or a  
27 responsible contribution so that our point is that if  
28 this is the approach we have been taking, the finger  
29 of criticism cannot be pointed at this community from  
30 those who say, "Well, everything is fine there. You just





1 don't care about the rest of the community", which  
2 I hope to point out later, as in other problems, is  
3 not the case.

4 We say there is an even stronger  
5 obligation than may ordinarily be the case to ensure  
6 if a change is to come one must be satisfied it is  
7 inevitable and going to be a better change for all.

8 May we respectfully draw your attention,  
9 getting on to page 9 of the brief, to pages 26 and 32  
10 of the Cumming Report of an earlier date. We think  
11 the matter is very well stated there, very clearly  
12 set out in these pages dealing with the Toronto  
13 proposal for amalgamation. It clearly sets out  
14 the many reasons to oppose amalgamation of the entire  
15 area; reasons which, in our judgment, are valid  
16 today and we simply have not repeated many of the  
17 statements in the brief because we felt that that  
18 would be an unnecessary waste.

19 Therefore, we state in very positive  
20 terms we oppose a completely centralized and  
21 consolidated form of government for the Metropolitan  
22 area. We say so because we think the benefits resulting  
23 are uncertain and the present need for improvements does  
24 not merit this.

25 This takes us to the end of page 10 and  
26 on page 11 we start a section where we make some  
27 comments on certain of the questions or problems that  
28 one may hear discussed or mentioned.

29 In dealing with the overall question of  
30 amalgamation as opposed to some other system, we first





1 draw attention to the fact that if you have an  
2 amalgamated system, you deal then with entire  
3 assessment and expenditures of a large area. Any  
4 expenditures regardless of the amount, is likely to  
5 have a small influence on the overall mill rate for  
6 the entire area and it is therefore possible it may  
7 not receive as close scrutiny and attention as the  
8 expenditures of a like nature may receive in a  
9 smaller community where it would have a more important  
10 or dramatic effect on the mill rate.

11 We then go on on page 12 into another  
12 question. We acknowledge that cooperative action  
13 between component members of an amalgamated or  
14 federated system can be diminished significantly if  
15 the members are separated by fundamental disparities  
16 in economic resources.

17 That is to say, in the present system,  
18 for example, one can be appreciative of the fact that  
19 the Reeve of the Township of Scarboro, to cite one,  
20 being aware of a local residential mill rate problem,  
21 may find it very hard, even though he strives to  
22 bring the Metropolitan concept, when he sits as a  
23 member on the Metropolitan Council, to deal with  
24 matters in that independent fashion when he knows that  
25 it may have a serious effect on the local tax rate and  
26 we see that kind of problem.

27 We believe, however, that solutions  
28 can be found within the borough system or city system  
29 or ward system or whatever appellation one wishes to  
30 place on the federated rather than the amalgamated area.





1                   We think that additional sources of  
2 revenue may come to municipalities are a result of  
3 the increasing demand for services and as a result  
4 of the Committees that are looking at the whole tax  
5 relationship and structure between the various levels  
6 of government. That is, additional sources may come  
7 other than property tax.

8                   THE COMMISSIONER: When you say that  
9 imaginative solutions can be found out of the existing  
10 type or framework, and you do not follow through with  
11 any suggested solutions; do I take it you prefer to  
12 leave this to my imagination?

13                  MR. PIVNICK: Well, if I were forced  
14 to give a one word answer to that question, sir,  
15 as between "Yes" and "No", it would have to be "Yes".

16                  Actually I think what we had in mind  
17 there was that, to give an example: For a long time  
18 there had been pressure to change the welfare services  
19 of Metro Council to have these services amalgamated  
20 as one service in the way in which the Police Force  
21 was amalgamated. Now, our Council took the view and  
22 many others took the view that the administration of  
23 welfare services would not be improved; in fact there  
24 was a serious possibility that it would have the  
25 opposite effect, by amalgamating it into one big service.

26                  It is our understanding, for example,  
27 that new ideas are now being formulated about such  
28 matters; that it is now up-to-date thinking to think  
29 in terms of administering such services to whole family  
30 units rather than, as in the past, a series of individual





1 services which grew sometimes out of the benevolence of  
2 some outstanding citizen in the community or for any  
3 other reason that resulted in a topsy type of growth

4           Nevertheless we recognize that there  
5 were financial problems that the City of Toronto had  
6 and we were willing to make contributions to it. One  
7 of the contributions was to take over certain of the  
8 services, the payment for them at the lesser level  
9 rather than leaving this to the individual. That is  
10 perhaps not as imaginative as it is an example of  
11 a kind of change. The imaginative solution could  
12 come possibly from having the rearrangement of certain  
13 grants.

14           It may be appropriate to recognize  
15 that a municipality in a particular location or a large  
16 area should have grants that may be somewhat dis-  
17 proportionate. This principle is recognized, I believe,  
18 by the Province in its giving of educational grants  
19 throughout the Province to attempt to make sure that  
20 there is at least a minimum standard of education  
21 province-wide and in order to accomplish this, there  
22 is a diversification in the grants.

23  
24  
25 -

26  
27  
28  
29 -  
30





1 In order to accomplish this there is a diversification  
2 in the grants. This is the kind of imaginative  
3 thing that might be done in a large metropolitan area  
4 of this kind - which, of course, I need not say is in  
5 itself perhaps larger in its financial and other  
6 problems than some of our provinces.

7 The next point that we touch on at page 14  
8 is this very question of the equality of services.  
9 This is a concept that one hears mentioned and no  
10 doubt has been and will be mentioned to you, sir, and I  
11 would respectfully comment that it is perhaps a difficult  
12 concept to deal with.

13 We feel, however, that to simply direct  
14 the enquiry to that end as a fundamental objective would  
15 be an impossible state of affairs. In other words we  
16 have to recognize that there is some inequality of  
17 services and that there is likely to be a neglect of  
18 services and, in the short term, that this is something  
19 that we are going to have to live with.

20 I think everyone has a right to expect that  
21 there should be a certain minimum level of service and  
22 that this should not be denied to any citizen of this  
23 area. But I do not think or the Council is of the view  
24 that it would not be possible to simply set out as an  
25 absolute objective of this Enquiry to be obtained to-  
26 morrow or at the earliest time an absolute equality of  
27 all services across the entire area.

28 It may be that one of the elements of choice  
29 that can be left to individuals in choosing the area  
30 in which they would like to live is that, assuming there





1 is this minimum level of services, various communities  
2 presumably will offer to their residents various  
3 additional services which they may pay for by an  
4 additional levy on their tax bill and which they would  
5 then have an opportunity to choose from.

6 The next point that we touch on with  
7 some intrepidation, but I do not think that one can  
8 not deal with it, is the question of representation -  
9 this representation by population, representation on  
10 a metropolitan council if in fact a continuation of a  
11 federated system should be your recommendation. This  
12 must be of concern to you as it was of concern to us.

13 It is the kind of thing that appears so  
14 popular and so acceptable that one finds it somewhat  
15 difficult to deal with. We can only offer one or two  
16 suggestions from our experience, which are as follows.

17 We have found that by having a smaller  
18 unit we are generally subjected to less pressure from  
19 the individual or group lobby. We believe that a  
20 positive result that flows from this is that one can  
21 decide matters somewhat more objectively than may be the  
22 case where representatives are from a larger area and  
23 are subjected to these very real pressures.

24 This is not to say that we are not in  
25 touch with our community, but that we feel that there  
26 is this important check in balance which a smaller  
27 community can bring in the federation. And this check  
28 in balance, it is to be noted, is an important part of  
29 the metropolitan system of government where it is very  
30 powerful.





1                   The United States Senate contains  
2 representatives, of course, that are not theirs by  
3 reason of a formula of representation by population.  
4 The Commissioner undoubtedly has full knowledge of the  
5 many theories of such representation stemming from the  
6 Roman Senate through John Stuart Mills' plurality system  
7 and many others.

8                   We think that one of the desirable trends  
9 that should be accomplished and accomplished quickly, if  
10 it is possible to do so, is to bring the second tier to  
11 the federation - the Edward Blake concept; the concept  
12 that when you are there you speak on behalf of the entire  
13 metropolitan community. You are not there as a delegate  
14 from your own constituency.

15                  That happens in the present case to be the  
16 reason that you sit on this Council, but once you have  
17 walked into that chamber you are speaking as a  
18 Metropolitan member and not on behalf of your own  
19 constituency.

20                  This is the way we see the proper function  
21 of the Metropolitan representative. If there is any  
22 merit in that view at all, sir, perhaps it is not unfair  
23 to ask, is there going to be a better solution by  
24 reason of the fact that five or six or indeed seven  
25 representatives from a large and populous community  
26 come to a federated level? Will there be an improvement  
27 of the operation of the second tier of government if they  
28 all come as representatives and additional representatives  
29 of that community rather than as representatives of the  
30 total metropolitan area - in short, five, six, seven,





1 eight, nine or ten (whatever the number of responsible  
2 men and women) sitting as metropolitan representatives  
3 thereby becoming the representatives of the total  
4 community and in that sense representing the entire  
5 population? Whereas any other number that one may  
6 choose to speak of composed of members coming from  
7 communities, the members having been arrived at because  
8 of some proportioning of the population of those com-  
9 munities - a relative proportion acting as representatives  
10 of those communities chosen because the population of  
11 that community results in (by applying arithmetic)  
12 X numbers - may not be improving the metropolitan level  
13 of government as such, even though it is a very  
14 popular concept and one that, because it appears so  
15 reasonable and so equitable, is one that is hard to  
16 deny.

17 On that point we simply end with a few  
18 lines from the Cumming Report at page 42. This is  
19 at page 15 of our brief. The Report states that forms  
20 of metropolitan organization in common with the more  
21 usual types of municipal government vary greatly in  
22 different jurisdictions and it seems reasonable to  
23 conclude that no theoretical solution has received  
24 general approval and that in most cases local circumstances  
25 and the pressure of immediate local problems have  
26 determined the selection of the particular expedient  
27 actually adopted.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: You did not think then  
29 that the fact that the reeve of an area municipality  
30 is automatically a member of Metropolitan Council, that





1 that form of representation would necessarily make him  
2 feel that he is there as the representative of his  
3 municipality and not the wider municipality?

4 MR. PIVNICK: I think in all frankness  
5 I must recognize the political facts of life and agree  
6 that that is likely the case today and therefore it may  
7 be necessary to have a representative at the metropolitan  
8 level who is not the reeve of the particular community.

9 I admit to not having for you a concrete  
10 recommendation that our Council makes on that point, but  
11 what I do urge that you give serious consideration to,  
12 sir, is this. Notwithstanding that there may be  
13 considerable pressure on the basis of this representation  
14 by population formula to have representatives in numbers  
15 come to that Metro tier of government, the very thing  
16 that prompts your question is likely to result in that  
17 kind of a position - that is to say, six, seven or eight  
18 people coming from Scarborough or three or four (whatever  
19 the arithmetic) and three or four from North York and  
20 three or four from Etobicoke coming there in each case.  
21 Their number is arrived at by a process of arithmetic and  
22 saying that they are now on their additional representatives  
23 on the Metro Council may not in practice really be so  
24 much better than the system which we of Forest Hill  
25 would find abhorrent, where the single representative  
26 would come but with a weighted vote, weighted four or  
27 five or six. In practice there may not be any greater  
28 benefit to the Metropolitan system by having those  
29 members who would come with that same view.

30 In other words what we urge is that some





1 method must be found. If it cannot indeed be found in  
2 the individual responsibility, the discipline, the self-  
3 imposed discipline of the representative, some method  
4 must be found whereby those who come together at the  
5 Metropolitan level must think and act and be Metropolitan  
6 representatives. If they are, it does not matter where  
7 they come from. There will be representation by pop-  
8 ulation in that sense.

9 At pages 16 and 17 we deal specifically  
10 with various of the services, and may I stress that in  
11 the remarks that are contained in these pages we were  
12 thinking in terms of the function of the service. I  
13 have not given consideration to the revenue considerations,  
14 so that if one were dealing with a specific service  
15 enumerated, in some cases the balance was ever so  
16 slight in favour of the recommendation that we made as  
17 to whether it be local or Metro and it could be that on  
18 a more exhaustive analysis of some of the financial  
19 considerations involved it might actually have tipped  
20 the balance slightly the other way in favour of the  
21 service -although we do not feel that that would be  
22 the case in very many.

23 I do not think that we are suggesting any-  
24 thing that is perhaps too revolutionary. I just draw  
25 your attention to the case of one or two. We think  
26 that improvements can be made to The Assessment Act,  
27 not to the functions. We think that it should  
28 properly continue to be throughout Metro, but we do  
29 think that it is time that a way was found of overcoming  
30 some of the fictions that are used in valuations and





1 that it would be helpful, once having established the  
2 assessment on a realistic and up-to-date basis, to  
3 eliminate the need to continue to do it each year. It  
4 perhaps could be reviewed every three years rather than  
5 annually. This would be an improvement.

6 THE COMMISSIONER: You want to get away  
7 from the 1940 level of values?

8 MR. PIVNICK: Yes.

9 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you see among the  
10 benefits a new relationship debt to assessment for  
11 example?

12 MR. PIVNICK: As a result of this?

13 THE COMMISSIONER: I mean, figures are  
14 presented to me showing in the case of one or two  
15 municipalities that debt is beginning to bear an  
16 unduly high relationship in relation towards assessment.

17 MR. PIVNICK: Yes.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Of course, what you  
19 are suggesting would mean a raising of assessments  
20 throughout the area.

21 MR. PIVNICK: Throughout the area, with  
22 a commensurate decrease in the mill rate likely to  
23 follow.

24 Taking a photograph of the situation today  
25 where you have an existing debt situation in any  
26 municipality, you would produce presumably the same  
27 number of tax dollars today if you simply increased the  
28 assessment and decreased the mill rate, so in that sense  
29 I do not see a disparity. It is the virtue, it seems  
30 to us, that you brought your valuations up-to-date. You





1 are dealing with reality rather than fiction.

2 Having done this we think there may be an  
3 improvement by not having to go and re-assess each year  
4 or to go through the motions of re-assessing each year -  
5 which is what I understand is done currently.

6 Then on matters of by-laws, I think our  
7 comments there perhaps do not need more elaboration  
8 than is there. We think it would certainly be desirable  
9 to have a uniform building by-law. It seems wrong in  
10 this day and age to feel that someone wishing to get on  
11 with a job of construction has to be concerned with  
12 whether he can use this or that material in this or  
13 that area municipality. Surely there can be standards  
14 of acceptability that would enable materials in the whole  
15 area to be informly used, and other such building matters.

16 The zoning by-laws: we think it likewise  
17 would be an improvement here - we are not saying there  
18 needs to be absolutely inform by-laws in all the areas  
19 or boroughs; not completely. But we do think it would  
20 be desirable to have more uniform definitions.

21 An apartment house in one area of  
22 Metropolitan Toronto ought not to be a different thing  
23 in another area municipality of Toronto - or an apart-  
24 ment hotel or residence second density or third density.

25 It seems to me it is not in the best  
26 public interest to continue with by-laws that make it  
27 rather difficult for the ordinary citizen to find his  
28 way through them. I do not think there would be any  
29 sacrifice that we can conceive of that would result from  
30 some uniformity of definition.





1 THE COMMISSIONER: But you are not sug-  
2 gesting a uniform Metropolitan zoning by-law?

3 MR. PIVNICK: I would say that we are very  
4 close to suggesting this. We have not. I think perhaps  
5 we held back from the recommendation because in all fair-  
6 ness to you I would have to state that we did not give  
7 it that detailed consideration which I believe such an  
8 important question merits. We perhaps shied away from  
9 going the way our inclination urged us because we did not  
10 have what we considered all the facts. But we do feel  
11 that in any event we can say, because this was abundantly  
12 clear to us, that there can be wide improvement by  
13 having more uniform definitions.

14 We make a recommendation about the T.T.C.

15 THE COMMISSIONER: Before you come to the  
16 T.T.C., I notice you recommend that hydro become a  
17 Metropolitan function?

18 MR. PIVNICK: Yes, we do, sir. We are  
19 unable to find those arguments that exist for separate  
20 commissions so weighty that we feel that the separate  
21 commissions need be continued. It seems to be a  
22 utility which naturally to us appears as one that can  
23 be administered better in a unified way. I cannot see  
24 the need for these independent boards in every area  
25 municipality as the local hydro-----

26 THE COMMISSIONER: Why do you want to  
27 retain a local superintendent or commission?

28 MR. PIVNICK: We think this is possibly  
29 a need that one would find administratively necessary  
30 for hydro. It is that kind of service. You could have





1 a road that is in need of repair. It may be a  
2 Metropolitan road and if it has a hole in it it is not  
3 so serious and the hole remains unrepaired for a few  
4 days and one puts a barrier or warning up. But hydro  
5 is the kind of thing that, as I understand its method  
6 of distribution, inevitably there is a need for local  
7 stations. It is not the kind of thing that one can  
8 just uniformly send through problems, technical problems  
9 of residences and whatnot. They do not present the  
10 same type of problem as in a road and therefore there  
11 may well be a need to have someone locally. He is the  
12 representative of the amalgamated commission.

13 THE COMMISSIONER: Oh, I see. I under-  
14 stood you were compromising there that the area  
15 municipality would appoint a local.....

16 MR. PIVNICK: No, I am sorry. I did not  
17 make that clear.

18 THE COMMISSIONER: Your logic is there.

19 MR. PIVNICK: This would only be the  
20 representative of the amalgamted commission.  
21  
22  
23  
24 -  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 -  
30





1 Our only point was to try and indicate  
2 it might be different than the Roads. The Metro  
3 Commissioner of Roads may be able to administer the  
4 whole Roads Department but we don't think the Metro  
5 Commissioner of Hydro would be able to do that. He  
6 would have to have a local representative, perhaps  
7 in a local office.

8 THE COMMISSIONER: I see you are not  
9 satisfied with the Metro licensing of all trades and  
10 so on.

11 MR. PIVNICK: That is another one of  
12 the problem services. Our experience has been that  
13 if the local by-laws have a substantial degree of  
14 uniformity they might well be administered by the  
15 local unit. It is the kind of problem again which  
16 one must be prepared to face frankly the criticism:  
17 Is this not a duplication of expense, a duplication of  
18 effort? Our answer to that is if it is worthwhile  
19 having a licence at all, and that whole discussion would  
20 open up a philosophical argument that would be imperti-  
21 nent of me to do at this time.

22 There are many services that are  
23 licensed that perhaps one could define, in the kind  
24 of community we live in, that don't have to be licensed  
25 as rigidly as they are.

26 If they need to have a licence we think  
27 the very things that the by-laws are attempting to  
28 control could best be controlled or administered, or  
29 best handled, in the local unit. If there is any  
30 kind of duplication on balance, the local attention





1 would outweigh that.

2 We think it is just simply the kind  
3 of problem of bigness that could make it difficult in  
4 communication, difficult in other ways to carry out  
5 the job.

6 Now the other one that perhaps is some-  
7 what unique is our recommendation about the TTC. We  
8 make the recommendation only on the assumption that  
9 the second tier representatives are full-time  
10 representatives, not as they presently are, part-time.  
11 We feel if there was a full-time Metro Government --  
12 and by "full-time Metro Government" I mean if the  
13 representatives on the Metro Government devoted their  
14 full time to the Metro Government, it would be perhaps  
15 unnecessary to have an Executive Committee. You would  
16 then be able to have perhaps a different form of  
17 standing committee system.

18 Logically and inevitably in our view  
19 there will come the day when transportation, and that  
20 involves more than simply public transit, this would  
21 involve transportation of people and vehicles and  
22 parking vehicles, they would come together in one  
23 Department administered full-time by the Council.  
24 It may not happen tomorrow because of the form of  
25 government that we now have. If there is a full-  
26 time Council this is an end which we think is desirable  
27 to work toward.

28 We see this trend has developed, or has  
29 been developed, in the changes that have been taking  
30 place over the years in the relationship between the TTC





1 and Metro and the changes in the Acts allowing for the  
2 financing.

3 We point out from time to time the  
4 services may need to be reviewed and there may need  
5 to be changes. This is the way we see them at the  
6 present time based on our experience.

7 We then end just briefly on the  
8 question of sociological considerations which may be  
9 inherent in the question of determining what is the  
10 best kind of political unit, indicating our agreement  
11 with the statement that people are a little more  
12 difficult to classify than things.

13 Then we just mention that the two  
14 tier system is an interesting laboratory of experience  
15 for other areas in the Province. We cannot offer that  
16 as an argument to maintain it as such but it is  
17 perhaps not an uninteresting thing to make that comment  
18 because no doubt the rest of the Province is watching  
19 this area, those areas faced with similar problems.

20 Then we come to our conclusions which  
21 are that we are opposed to the total amalgamation into  
22 one city of all the present area municipalities. We  
23 believe that federation is preferable to one amalgamated  
24 city. We think because the newspapers in the area  
25 have been so long and vocal in their support of one  
26 amalgamated city that perhaps this has tended to obscure  
27 in the minds of many citizens the considerable benefits  
28 of the alternatives.

29 THE COMMISSIONER: You say nothing about  
30 the so-called borough system.





1 MR. PIVNICK: The so-called borough  
2 system, as we understand that expression, sir, is  
3 the recommendation of four or five or six boroughs  
4 into a federation.

5 THE COMMISSIONER: That is how it has  
6 been presented to me.

7 MR. PIVNICK: Well now, in complete  
8 candiddness I do admit that our conclusions are  
9 somewhat negative in character. They do say what  
10 we are against. They are not so clear in what we are  
11 for.

12 I would refer back to page 8 where  
13 we talk of the proper contribution to the Metro System.  
14 We are saying, I think, in effect, that it is not  
15 for us to make out a case for a change. Now this is  
16 a narrow brief, it is the Forest Hill brief. It is  
17 really for us to point out that we have been doing  
18 the job properly. We have been acting properly. If  
19 this is so we have the right to say if you wish the  
20 parts to act properly, and if they are smaller than  
21 the whole, if we are playing our part properly then  
22 there is also a duty on the whole to make out the case.

23 Now that is not the form in which this  
24 presentation takes but this does colour our attitude.  
25 We therefore did not go into what we think would have  
26 to be a very elaborate analysis. We do not think, for  
27 example, that it is of much assistance, if I may say  
28 so with respect, to the Commissioner to come here with  
29 a recommendation of a borough system arrived at by some  
30 method of taking a pencil and drawing some lines on the





1 map. If there is a change to take place surely one  
2 of the fundamental principles that must be taken into  
3 consideration is the taxing unit.

4 If you are going to establish a system  
5 of boroughs it is not surely as simple as taking a  
6 look at a map and saying: "There seems to be a wobbly  
7 boundary here. We would propose to lop this off and  
8 have it end at this Metro street." That may be the  
9 result and it may be a desirable result. It is  
10 putting the cart before the horse. It should come  
11 as a result of more fundamental consideration.

12 When I say a "taxing unit" I have in  
13 mind one would need to see what is the balance between  
14 residential and industrial and commercial and what  
15 is likely to be the future trend in that particular  
16 municipality. This is surely a broad area that  
17 must be sketched out and thought out first before  
18 one can simply define the area.

19 THE COMMISSIONER: You said it should  
20 not be a case of just drawing a line on the map. When  
21 I asked you that question I was not thinking of  
22 drawing a line on a map. I was thinking of the two  
23 recommendations given us to erase a line on the map,  
24 the line between York and Forest Hill.

25 MR. PIVNICK: Could you inform me as  
26 to the two? I understood this was the recommendation  
27 of Chairman Allen. I am not aware of the other.

28 THE COMMISSIONER: I think York Township.

29 MR. PIVNICK: York simply eliminated  
30 the line between York and Forest Hill?





1 THE COMMISSIONER: I was underlining  
2 the comments. You don't have to say anything. I  
3 don't want to put you in an embarrassing position.

4 MR. PIVNICK: Thank you very much for  
5 that suggestion, sir. I don't think that I can dodge  
6 attempting to answer that question. I think it is  
7 such a proper question and so inevitable to say:  
8 "Well now, if you are against something, what are you  
9 for?"

10 We haven't studied the problem from  
11 the standpoint of whether that would be a desirable  
12 alternative. We would be happy, if it would assist  
13 the Commission in any way, to reserve our rights and  
14 comments and attempt a study of the specific problem  
15 of that kind that may be put to us.

16 I must regrettably repeat myself  
17 briefly. Our approach has been, since we felt that  
18 we had been making our contribution properly, we had  
19 been doing the job properly, that we can honestly say  
20 we believe that amalgamation was not the answer and  
21 something else had to be very much more desirable.  
22 Something would have to be preponderantly more  
23 desirable for the whole area before we felt that we  
24 would have to go into this long analysis of whether  
25 we should erase the boundary with York Township.

26 I would make only this other comment,  
27 if I may, in discussing the answer fully to your  
28 question: One of our recommendations does contain  
29 implicitly another alternative because we say that one  
30 pursuit or one way in which this question may be dealt





1 with is not just to assume the boundaries of the City  
2 of Toronto are immortalized as they now exist, and  
3 should not be tampered with. On the contrary, we  
4 say there seems to be a tendency for some to think  
5 of those boundaries as fixed and any system that  
6 expands outward we think there is a very real  
7 possibility a better result could come from a movement  
8 inward and that the City of Toronto as such may become  
9 more of the core, the financial core of a large  
10 Metropolitan area.

11               Indeed that kind of thing is shown on  
12 one of the City of Toronto Development Plans. It  
13 shows a core of this city defined in black, as I  
14 recall it, on this particular map, in the heart of  
15 the City. If one were looking at this map and had  
16 addressed one's self to the specific question of  
17 erasing a boundary, it is not impossible to imagine a  
18 better solution might come from moving it eastward  
19 rather than eliminating it westward.

20               We don't come with a specific recommend-  
21 ation of that kind, but we would be happy to consider  
22 it if the Commissioner felt it would be of any  
23 assistance.

24               We do think in conclusion that the  
25 Metropolitan tier of the structure should be  
26 unquestionably paramount in its defined spheres and  
27 that the resultant structure, after any necessary  
28 changes, should, if possible, be flexible enough to  
29 provide for future required changes and growths.

30               We think that it is a very difficult





1 thing in approaching this problem to unshackle one's  
2 self from fixed ideas that one may have grown up with and  
3 accepted as axiomatic. These are ideas which have perhaps  
4 existed from the very days of the founding of municipal  
5 government, from the days of Durham and Baldwin and  
6 Sydenham, the concept of the rule of the municipality.  
7 It has changed and we are in a very dynamic community.

8 At the municipal level we have very  
9 serious and great problems to tackle and we therefore  
10 feel that because of this serious kind of problem that  
11 we have in the municipal government in this area that  
12 it is for this reason that we support this kind of  
13 inquiry where you can have the point of view brought to  
14 you. Then you can make a study that is based on looking  
15 at a very, very changing world. That is not theoretical.  
16 It is not happening somewhere else. It is happening  
17 right here. North York has been for many years the  
18 fastest growing community in relative times in the North  
19 American continent. That means that things are happening  
20 before us. In order to cope with them properly we must  
21 release ourselves from the shackles of the past.

22 This brief is signed by all the members  
23 of the Council of Forest Hill because it is their brief.  
24 We did not have outside assistance. We submit it to  
25 you respectfully in the name of the community of  
26 Forest Hill and thank you very much for this hearing.

27 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you, Mr. Pivnick.  
28 The Commission is now adjourned until Tuesday, April  
29 28th, at 10:00 A.M.













